DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 847 HE 001 138

Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid. The Study of Education at Stanford. Report to the University.
Stanford Univ., Calif.
Report No-R-4
Pub Date Dec 68
Note-83p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Admission Criteria, *College Bound Students, College Choice, Competitive Selection, Educational Objectives, *Financial Support, *Higher Education, Talent Identification, *Undergraduate Study
Identifiers-*Stanford University

This report, the fourth in a series of ten, was prepared by the Steering Committee, the Study of Education at Stanford. The series, based on the concept that education should be a continuous process of discovery throughout life, sets forth recommendations for strengthening the academic enterprise at Stanford University. This booklet presents 5 reports of the Topic Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid; the recommendations in these reports were adopted by the Steering Committee. It is proposed that procedures for student selection be based on many separate categories rather than on a single set of criteria. A pool of potential applicants could assess themselves for selection on the basis of categories within which Stanford students compete, the approximate percentages to be chosen from each category, and the level of achievement that would ensure a reasonable chance of selection. Current students and faculty could provide their descriptions of the university and understanding, encouragement, and help in decision-making. The applicants selected would decide whether or not to enroll and whether their financial needs can be met. The university's goal should be to provide sufficient financial aid funds to meet the needs of all accepted applicants. Copies of this report may be requested in writing from: Study of Education at Stanford, Room 107, Building 10A, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document] (WM)

The Study of Education
at Stanford

Report to the
University

dergraduate Admissions
Financial Aid

IV

Contents

Preface

This is one of a series of reports, which we submit to the University community for its consideration. The first of our reports, *The Study and Its Purposes* stated the general premises on which our recommendations turn. The remainder of this series, in the approximate order of issuance, includes the following:

II. *Undergraduate Education*
III. *University Residences and Campus Life*
IV. *Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid*
V. *Advising and Counseling*
VI. *The Extra-Curriculum*
VII. *Graduate Education*
VIII. *Teaching, Research, and the Faculty*
IX. *Study Abroad*
X. *Government of the University*

Comments on these reports, and requests for copies, should be addressed in writing to Study of Education at Stanford, Room 107, Building 10A, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305.

Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

December 1968

Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

Herbert L. Packer, *Chairman*
Professor of Law and Vice Provost

Norton T. Batkin III
Undergraduate student in Philosophy

James F. Gibbons
Professor of Electrical Engineering

Albert H. Hastorf
Executive Head and Professor of Psychology

Joshua Lederberg
Executive Head and Professor of Genetics

Mark Mancall
Associate Professor of History

Michael M. Menke
A.B. Princeton 1963;
Graduate student in Physics

Anne G. Osborn
A.B. Stanford 1965
Graduate Student in Medicine

Leonard I. Schiff
Professor of Physics

Robert R. Hind
Staff Director, Study of Education at Stanford

Undergraduate Admissions & Financial Aid

Report of the
Steering Committee

Our previous reports to the University have called for an increase in the opportunities for students to define their own educational needs and to pursue their own goals through independent work. Concomitant with this is a growing need to question, criticize, modify, and review educational goals and programs. Thus, we reject the philosophy that we can or should require a core curriculum of all students; and, although we propose alternatives, we recognize the possibility that they will require modification and submit them as experimental programs, the results of which must be closely evaluated.

These two themes, the development of programs that are experimental and adaptable, and the encouragement of individuality, are again prominent in the recommendations contained in this report. Adopting the recommendations of the topic committee—the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid—we argue against the selection of students through a single set of admissions criteria; we recommend instead multiple, independent criteria. Just as there should be many ways to "get an education" at Stanford, so should there be many ways to be admitted to Stanford. The procedure we will propose makes explicit those aspects of our current admissions practice that are in fact characterized by multiple, independent criteria.

In this introduction to the topic committee reports, we will discuss selected goals of particular importance that are supported by many of the specific recommendations listed on pages 24 to 76. The background information, rationales, and supporting data that are necessary to an understanding of

specific recommendations are contained in the reports themselves. The page citations following each recommendation or group of recommendations refer to the relevant information to be found in the topic committee reports. The Steering Committee endorses virtually all of each separate topic committee report.

To a very large extent, the Stanford applicant pool forms itself through processes over which we have little, if any, control. A high school student's family background, his academic ability and motivation, the expectations of his family and peers–these factors and many more affect not only the probability of his applying to Stanford, but also the probability of his continuing his formal education at all. The image of "the Stanford student" also plays a crucial role, crucial because images are self-fulfilling. An image, however arrived at, is used as a guide, a predictor of one's chances of admission; and, because it generally results in restricting the applicant pool to those who fit the image or think that they do, the image itself is perpetuated and strengthened. The question here is not one of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the characteristics of our current undergraduate student body; our dissatisfaction is with the power of the image to determine our student body.

If a student body must have a unitary image, Stanford's is a good one. To it, and to the unstinting efforts of our admissions officers belongs the credit for the exceptionally high academic qualifications of our students and the high academic quality of our applicant pool. To fit the image, the single trait of academic excellence must be buttressed by a variety of skills and accomplishments in other areas; to name a few, school government, athletics, dramatics, or debating. There is nothing inherently distressing about this notion. In practice, however, this results in the "all-around" stereotype, the essence of which is that one must be everything simultaneously. We think that this aspect of our students' image is both strongly operative and strongly undesirable. It is not true that one must be "all-around" to be accepted at Stanford; that people *think* it is true, however, is sufficient to set into operation the self-fulfilling character of the image.

We are not in any way trying to slight the Renaissance Man who is good at everything; it must be very pleasant. But most people, we insist, are not like that, and it is at best pointless to act as if they were. We do not argue, therefore, that our student body lacks diversity. We do argue that the mutually reinforcing processes of admissions and image formation hide their diversity behind an "all-around" facade that prevents the deliberate selection *for* diversity.

To break into this circle, we present the solution of our topic committee: *explicitly select from the pool of qualified applicants those with peak talents, with the possibility of one such talent being sufficient for selection.* In essence, the topic committee argues for competition and assessment of applicants within clearly defined categories rather than across categories, for discrete rather than global decisions. An outstanding operational feature of this procedure is that it facilitates evaluation of the results it produces. As needs and goals change, or evaluative evidence accumulates, the content of the system can readily be changed to produce different results without modifying the procedure itself.

To the potential applicant asking, "Can I get in?" we should present a description of those categories within which Stanford applicants will compete, an indication of the percentages to be chosen from each category, and the level of achievement that would ensure a reasonable chance of selection. The student can then assess himself, and, in the application form, present evidence of achievement relevant to the distinct categories. To all our publics, descriptions of the procedure must emphasize that categories can be expected to change as our experience grows, our methods of assessment improve, and our goals and needs change.

The potential applicant also asks, "What is Stanford like?" The answer to this question depends a great deal upon the position of the respondent in the University community; the most relevant answer for the potential applicant would be that given by a current undergraduate or faculty member. For this reason, and others, we propose much greater utilization of student and faculty resources for this difficult task. Both the task and the involvement of new people in it are important supplements to the current high school visiting program conducted by the Admissions Office.

We see therefore considerable merit in the topic committee's recommendation that what is currently called recruiting be divided into two parts: 1) assessment and preselection, to be done by the potential applicants themselves on the basis of specific information, perhaps supplemented by an interview with a member of our admissions staff, and 2) describing the University, to be done largely by current students and faculty. The people involved in these activities must be fully aware that, whatever their specific purpose in visiting high schools, potential college applicants are often bewildered and frustrated by the decisions they must make. Helping them to make wise decisions requires more than simply providing information, however useful that may be; equally essential are understanding and encouragement.

Applicants who are accepted must decide whether or not to enroll, their decision depending largely upon two factors: whether or not they were accepted elsewhere as well, and whether or not their need for financial aid, if any, was adequately met. The University's goal should be to provide sufficient financial aid funds to allow meeting the financial need of all accepted applicants. Meeting this goal would remove one major obstacle to the formation of an ideal undergraduate student body. Currently, however, large numbers of Stanford students must be able to pay their own way. To the extent that these students take up places that we cannot then offer to others who are more desirable, the ideal "mix" of students will not be fully realized. Until the financial aid budget reaches an adequate level, the ideal can best be approximated by formally and intimately relating the two operations of admissions and aid allocations; that is, using our financial aid resources to promote the fullest possible realization of our admissions goals (for example, the current emphasis on increasing minority-group enrollment). Just as we argue that assessment categories in admissions should be expected to change, so should priorities in aid allocation. Combining these two operations into a single process should promote both consistency and adaptability.

Before listing our recommendations, one final note is in order. In any discussion of admissions, it is easy to lose sight of the distinction between procedures and values, or means and ends. That we recommend changes in procedure should not be taken as criticism of the values that the current procedure seeks to maximize. We see a need for a procedure that can be easily modified so as to promote, from year to year, the achievement of a wide variety of goals.

Summary of Recommendations

The Stanford Applicant Pool (pp.15–26)

1. Stanford should establish a Recruiting Council composed of representatives of students (including minority-group representatives), faculty, administration (Undergraduate Studies and Admissions), alumni, and University Relations.

2. Under supervision of the Recruiting Council, Stanford students, together with faculty and recent alumni, should be given increased responsibility for eliciting a wide range of applicants to the undergraduate student body. It is particularly important that minority-group students participate with other students in the recruiting effort.

3. Stanford should publicize the academic and social background characteristics of present students in a way that highlights diversity rather than homogeneity. This information should depict specific characteristics and not global profiles; supplementary anecdotal material should also be used.

   a. The *Stanford University Bulletin* should be the primary source of information, revised annually to describe current projects and experiments, such as changes in living situations for undergraduates.

   b. *The Undergraduate at Stanford* should be rewritten to characterize student interests, activities, and problems, as well as specific innovations, commitments, and healthy confrontations of opposing views that contribute to campus dynamics.

c. At least one issue of the *Stanford Observer* should be mailed to every potential applicant who requests information about Stanford.

d. A new publication for all students and applicants should show that everybody at Stanford belongs simultaneously to several minority groups—defined by race, age, rank, work, specialization, religion, politics, etc. This publication should be used for recruiting in high schools with large concentrations of minority-group students.

Selection Procedures and Criteria for Freshman Admissions (pp.27–53)

4. Selection of students for freshman admission should be performed within many separate and distinct competition categories, each category defining a specific type of achievement. An applicant demonstrating competitive excellence in one such area should be accepted without reference to his rank position in other categories.

5. The Senate Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid should be charged with the responsibility for defining the following elements of the proposed procedure:

a. Minimum requirements, without which there is no reasonable chance of success at Stanford; applicants not meeting these requirements would not be considered further.

b. Achievement characteristics for each of the separate competitions, that is, specifying those types of achievement to be established as competition categories.

c. Selection standards for each competition category; essentially the operational definition of the different achievement levels to be assessed in each of the competition categories.

d. The proportion of students to be admitted from each competition.

e. The "non-achievement characteristics" (preferential categories, such as faculty or alumni children, minority groups) to be accorded preference within certain specified competition categories.

f. The proportion of admissions to be represented by each non-achievement category; this specification would determine the size of the "bonus" to be given for each non-achievement characteristic; within the limits of the applicant pool, a cyclical procedure would award bonuses of increasing size until the desired quotas were reached.

6. The Senate Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid should be the primary policy-making body with respect to admissions. It should periodically assess and redefine competition categories and preference characteristics on the basis of accumulated experience.

7. The application form should briefly describe the admissions procedures, specify the competition categories and selection criteria, and elicit information directly relevant to the competitions.

Transfer Admissions (pp.54–57)

8. Admissions procedures for transfer students should be altered to correspond to the recommended procedures for freshmen.

9. With the exception of certain special programs, transfer students should possess no less academic potential than incoming freshmen.

10. All transfer students should be guaranteed on-campus housing for their first year at Stanford if they desire it.

Minority-Group Students at Stanford (pp. 58–71)

Most of the recommendations presented and discussed on pages 68–71 of the topic committee interim report (released on April 2, 1968) are already in effect. We present them in abridged form below; those that have not yet been put into effect, or that have not been given sufficient priority, are preceded by an asterisk.

***11. Recruiting efforts in high schools of predominantly minority-group enrollment should be intensified and extended to more such schools outside the state of California.**

12. Minority-group students currently enrolled at Stanford should be involved in the recruitment effort.

***13. Special publications should be developed with the minority-group applicant in mind (cf. Recommendation 3).**

***14. More vigorous attention should be given to the active recruiting of minority-group students in the junior colleges of California.**

***15. The possibility should be explored of a formal tie with an institution like the College of San Mateo, which has an active and apparently successful minority-group recruiting program. Such a tie should involve joint recruiting and a commitment for Stanford to admit a specified number of students with the necessary financial aid if they do well in their junior college programs.**

***16. Admissions and procedures should favor applicants from minority groups. Assessment of applicants should take account of our experience with minority-group students who are already enrolled here (cf. Recommendation 5).**

17. Special efforts should be made to encourage accepted minority-group applicants to enroll at Stanford.

18. Grading policies should be modified to reduce competitive pressures, particularly during the freshman year (cf. Report II, *Undergraduate Education*, Recommendation 29).

Undergraduate Financial Aid (pp. 72–76)

19. The level of undergraduate financial aid should continue to be determined on the basis of an individual's computed "need."

20. The financial aid budget, once set, should be guaranteed as a minimum for periods of several years each.

21. The University should work toward the goal of allocating sufficient financial aid resources to meet the needs of all accepted applicants.

22. The processes of making admissions and financial aid decisions should be closely linked and guided by formal, clearly defined, and publicly announced procedures.

23. Priorities in the awarding and types of financial aid, and the relationship of financial aid to admissions should be as shown in the following table.

Distribution of Freshman Financial Aid Resources

Priority	Type of Aid
1. Aid applicants from minority groups who meet the open competition for admission.	Grant which, coupled with established family contribution, will cover all costs.
2. Aid applicants from minority groups who do not meet the open competition but who are admitted by special arrangement.	Grant which, coupled with established family contribution, will cover all costs.

Priority	Type of Aid
3. Aid applicants of outstanding merit, not to exceed 5 to 10 percent of total admittees.	Grant which, coupled with established family contribution, will cover all costs.
4. Aid applicants from all competition categories (cf. Recommendation 4), ranked in order, admitted without regard for or referral to financial need. The number of admittees in this group will be set so that the financial needs of the last admittee will exhaust the available aid.	All costs will be covered by a combination of: 1) established family contribution, 2) loan (possibly up to $400–$500 per year), 3) grant and work, after maximum loan has been given.
5. (If necessary to fill admissions quota.) Aid applicants from all competition categories, ranked in order, admitted without regard for or referral to financial need.	No financial aid provided. (It can be expected that those applicants with large financial need will not enroll at Stanford.)

24. Financial aid policy relating to the continuation and form of aid allocations should be explicitly stated and the decision criteria well publicized.

25. The University should find the means for establishing a long-term, low-interest, loan fund available to *all* students.

26. Matriculated undergraduates who develop financial need should be given consideration equal to the consideration given to those currently receiving financial aid.

27. Financial aid policies and procedures applied to freshmen should not in principle be varied with respect to transfer students.

28. The element of work in the aid package should be reviewed; jobs having little to do with the educational process should be minimized, and jobs involving educational merit or status should be maximized.

Report of the Topic Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid

Letter of Transmittal

To: The Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

From: William A. Clebsch, *Chairman*
Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid

Gentlemen:

Your Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid now submits its report and recommendations. Our report consists of statements and recommendations of the several subcommittees as revised and adopted by the parent Committee. Our topic became too complex and our time too short to make neat recommendations standing independent of discussion. Data which substantiate our findings are various and mountainous, ranging from informal, unrecorded interviews to bulky computer printouts; those reduced or reducible to writing we submit to you.

A table of contents of this report is almost a table of our subcommittees:

1. Forming the Applicant Pool
2. Selection Procedures and Criteria
3. Transfer Admissions
4. Minority-Group Students at Stanford—An Interim Report
5. Undergraduate Financial Aid

Appendices

We also submit our report and recommendations on Graduate Admissions and Awards, understanding that the Steering Committee wishes to place this report with others having to do with graduate study.

In our judgment the minority-group program adopted by the University in April and May 1968 for implementation beginning September 1969 substantially carried out the recommendations we had presented to the Steering Committee on this topic late in March and to the University at large on April 2.

I find it virtually impossible to name the persons who served as members of our Committee, for its numerous subcommittees turned it into a kind of floating crap game. The following had separate but not equal turns at the dice: Norton Batkin, John D. Black, William Alexander, Sandra Shapiro, J. Merrill Carlsmith, Bernard P. Cohen, Clarkson H. Oglesby, Lincoln E. Moses, John L. Mothershead, Jr., Robert M. Rosenzweig, Michael M. Roberts, Julia Hirsch, and myself. Changing the figure, the heat and toil left us attrited. When the whistle blew, there stood on the field, fatigued and gallant, Batkin, Carlsmith, Cohen, Oglesby, Moses, Mothershead, Rosenzweig, and Roberts.

The policies we are proposing commended themselves in many different ways. We sought to lay aside whatever was not: 1) conservative of the academic excellence achieved in the student body under policies adopted in 1958; 2) explicit enough to be understandable by every legitimate constituency of the University, including applicants to its freshman classes; 3) adaptable to changing circumstances of the present and foreseeable future; and 4) controllable both by prospective intention and retrospective evaluation.

We do not doubt that our study has burdened the staff presently administering financial aid and admissions at Stanford. Neither do we doubt that we are suggesting departures—perhaps some radical ones—from their approved practices. We found them faithful to the policies and guidelines of their respective mandates; we hope they will perceive the many points at which their counsel shaped our recommendations.

Should these recommendations be adopted, their implementation will of course present administrative and personnel problems. Concerning these we report nothing. To be sure, they commanded our attention and concern. To carry out that concern, we asked one member to enter the Committee's discussions only at the point where subcommittee reports were being revised and adopted, with primary interest in implementation and its attendant prob-

lems. This member conferred with one person who served on our Committee from its inception, and with another person who remained aloof from the Committee and its work. Proposals arising from their deliberations will be presented separately to the chairman of the Steering Committee.

I have asked Dean Snyder and Dr. Huff to favor the Committee by calling to the Steering Committee's attention any errors of misunderstanding, reckoning, or nuance that may, despite our care and safeguards, have infiltrated our findings. We thank them for this and a thousand other favors.

As your chairman, I record gratitude to the scores of people at Stanford—by no means all of whom I could name—whose labors in the end dispelled the seeming impossibility of the task you assigned us. A medal should go to each member of our Committee for diligence beyond the call of duty and for long suffering toward a chairman who was often slow-witted, sometimes irascible, and never hopeful. In their name and in my own I applaud the Steering Committee for flying the flag of that kind of critical self-study that aspires to excellence.

November 4, 1968

1. Forming the Applicant Pool

Report of the topic committee

The Importance of the Applicant Pool

Applicants to Stanford's undergraduate body are highly homogeneous in at least two areas—social background characteristics and records of participation in various activities during high school. As long as this homogeneity persists, it is a mistake to think that revising admissions criteria alone could produce a markedly different undergraduate constituency. Since rapid social change can demand that Stanford admit on short notice students possessing a particular new characteristic, the applicant pool too must be capable of rapid change as well as being genuinely diverse. Whether Stanford students should be more diverse is not our present interest; we argue here that Stanford should *be able* on short notice to diversify its student body.

Stanford's applicant pool should of course be composed of applicants who show promise both to profit from and contribute to the high quality of education to which Stanford is dedicated. Within that general policy, the pool should: 1) embrace students who exhibit a wide variety of talents, interests, and social background characteristics; 2) include a broad range for *each* attribute from "possessing x to a high degree" to "does not have x or want to have it"; 3) be capable of change in a given year at Stanford's behest with regard to any particular characteristic.

This report will first characterize the prevailing applicant pool at Stanford. Next it will identify factors that determine the character of the applicant

pool. Then it will explore alternatives, with respect to personnel and publications, for changing the applicant pool. Finally it will make specific recommendations; an appendix outlines a plan of recruiting by students.

Some Characteristics of the Prevailing Applicant Pool

A study was made of the admissions information available on 824 applicants for 1966–67. The following tables illustrate selected characteristics of the Stanford applicant pool for that year, as projected from the sample data.

Social Background

Father's Occupation			*Mother's Occupation*	
Male	*Female*		*Male*	*Female*
%	%		%	%
35	32	Professional	14	17
38	38	Managerial	2	2
12	13	Clerical, sales	14	13
12	10	Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled	2	2
3	6	Retired, unemployed, deceased	–	–
–	–	Housewife	69	66

Father's Employer			*Mother's Employer*	
Male	*Female*		*Male*	*Female*
%	%		%	%
13	16	Self-employed	2	3
20	15	Government	12	11
3	2	Private, non-profit organization	1	2
61	61	Private, profit organization	13	16
4	7	Can't determine, unemployed	73	69

Father's Education			*Mother's Education*	
Male	*Female*		*Male*	*Female*
%	%		%	%
4	6	Ivy League	3	4
7	7	Univ. Calif. system	4	4
2	2	Calif. State College system	2	2
28	25	Public university	17	19
13	15	Private university	5	6
1	1	Elite college	–	–
6	4	Other college	5	4
–	2	Junior college	2	–
35	37	Some college, no college	60	57
4	1	Degree granted, school unknown	2	3

Area of Residence

	Male %	*Female* %
East	13	14
South	2	–
Midwest	20	13
California	47	55
Other west	14	15
Foreign	5	2

Race of Applicant

	Male %	*Female* %
White	93	94
Negro	2	3
Oriental	6	2

Type of High School Attended

	Male %	*Female* %
Public	80	72
Private, non-Catholic	16	18
Private, Catholic	4	10

Interests and Activities

Probable Major

	Male %	*Female* %
Engineering	14.0	0.6
Earth sciences	.9	0.0
Other sciences	27.8	11.5
Math	11.1	11.3
Social sciences	5.4	13.0
English	3.3	9.7
Economics, pol. sci.	13.5	8.6
History, humanities	5.2	7.3
Foreign languages	0.8	15.7
Arts	2.2	3.9
Undecided	15.8	18.5

Probable Career

	Male %	*Female* %
Physician	15.1	11.3
Lawyer	18.6	7.7
Scientist	8.8	2.8
Businessman	5.7	.9
Engineer	12.0	.6
Artist	0.4	6.3
Teacher (secondary)	4.9	21.9
Professor	4.9	5.1
Other professional	12.4	22.1
Housewife	0.3*	0.0
Government	3.1	9.1
Undecided	13.8	12.2

*This figure is apparently the result of either a prank or a coding error.

Received Academic Honors

	Male %	*Female* %
No	10	12
Yes	90	88

Athletic Activities

	Male %	*Female* %
No	16	40
Yes, non-varsity	32	47
Yes, varsity	12	3
Yes, both	40	11

Music, Art

	Male %	*Female* %
No	63	48
Yes, music	32	40
Yes, art	3	6
Yes, both	1	6

Service Organizations

	Male %	*Female* %
No	15	14
Yes	85	86

Held High School Office

	Male %	*Female* %
No	41	33
Yes	59	67

Dramatics, Forensics

	Male %	*Female* %
No	59	50
Yes, drama	19	29
Yes, forensics	18	13
Yes, both	5	7

Journalistic, Literary

	Male %	*Female* %
No	66	51
Yes	34	49

Summer, Part-time work

	Male %	*Female* %
No	24	32
Yes	76	68

Before drawing any conclusions from these data, it must first be stressed that the application form itself does not facilitate identification of *ranges* over individual characteristics. Two proposals in the following paper, Selection Procedures and Criteria, would lessen this problem: 1) that the application form request applicants to cite their *achievements* in a large number of areas including all those within which competitions will take place; and 2) that each such area be assessed and given a number from 1 to 4, indicating the degree to which the applicant has demonstrated talent in that area. It would then be a simple matter to determine the extent to which the applicant pool in any year achieves the goals indicated on the first page of this report.

With respect to the social background characteristics illustrated above, we conclude that a broader range over each characteristic is essential in order to support any admissions policy of different or changing criteria. Until the application form is redesigned to permit assessing degree of talents and interests, we cannot conclude that broader ranges are essential here as well, though we suspect that is the case.

Factors Shaping the Applicant Pool

What factors influence a high school student's decision to apply to Stanford or to any other institution of higher education?

In an effort to learn more about the family and peer influences on application decisions, informal interviews were conducted by five Stanford undergraduates in various high schools in spring 1968. They found "status" a predominant influence, the determination of status being based on the opinions of family and friends, national publicity, athletic reputation, and location. Also important as indicators were their opinions of fellow students applying to the same school and, occasionally, of former students who were attending Stanford. "Fitness" is crucial—i.e., the "fit" between a student's image of the school and his image of himself, especially as compared with others who have fit (or think that they will). Principal elements in reckoning fitness are the student's academic record, school activities, and interests. Often the high school counselor, who may know of past applications to the same school, is asked to help determine the fit. This counselor is an intermediary who knows what the school or the student tells him, plus what past records show. With respect to the student, these records include grades, achievement test scores, academic honors, and school activity participation. With respect to the school, the counselor knows what applicants were previously accepted or rejected and the degree to which he felt they fit his image of Stanford.

Counselors assess the probability of an applicant's being accepted by referring to profiles of the current freshman classes in various colleges and universities; counselors also refer to the freshman year GPA of college students from the counselor's own school.

The counselor's job, inherently a sticky one, is made more difficult when parents expect the counselor to get their children into specific schools, and admissions officers urge the counselor to send them his very best applicants. As B. Alden Thresher observes in his *College Admissions and the Public Interest* (page 53):

> At [the] lowest and least imaginative level, . . .the high school counselor tries to make the best possible bargain on behalf of his client for admission to a strong college. In an independent school the student is quite literally a client, and in the eyes of status conscious parents, a school's reputation may, to an embarrassing degree, depend on its success in getting its graduates into the particular colleges favored by its parent group, an objective often only

remotely related to the genuine educational worth of the processes carried on in these colleges, or their suitability for the students concerned.

The counselor, if tempted to 'oversell' a candidate, knows that he is always subject to the risk that another year the college will be more wary of his recommendations. The admissions officer in turn has a recruiting problem or thinks he has. He is looking for the strongest students, or those who in his scheme of values are deemed more 'desirable.' In such an atmosphere of negotiation it is very easy to fall into a predominantly bargaining habit of thought, losing sight of the fact that both parties to the transaction are in a deeper sense obligated to act as trustees for the student's welfare, and to serve in a fiduciary capacity, giving him the benefit of whatever special skill and experience they can muster. What the student or his parents want, or think they want, may not represent the wisest educational solution. But they have a right to choose. Solutions cannot be imposed on them. It is a task of persuasion and diplomacy to carry them, perhaps, some distance but not all the way toward what seems the best solution. There are no certainties; guidance, like politics, remains the art of the possible.

Given these pressures, it is no surprise to find counselors who rely heavily or mechanically on such information as the freshman profile in advising a student whether or not to apply to Stanford. These pressures tend to elide the moral issue as to whether the good of the student, the college, or the society is served when a counselor encourages application to a given college only by students whose academic records predict admission there and whose ability records and personality traits resemble that college's students. From the college's viewpoint, Thresher thinks that these pressures result in a tendency for selection to become a substitute for education (*op. cit.* p. 22).

Because of pressures to get the "right" students into the "right" schools, counselors preselect in a manner that undercuts the potential diversity of Stanford's applicant pool. Few students are urged to apply who do not have a variety of extracurricular activities to supplement their academic achievements. High school students, we are led to believe, recognize the importance of this stereotyped diversity and may consciously cultivate it in order to appear to be more viable Stanford applicants.[1]

[1] We suspect that, after a few, fearful, freshman months, these students realize that their peers are not all *really* like that; they relax and become sophomores with varied collections of interests and skills. In short, we believe that the absence of diversity in the applicant pool is more apparent than real; however, the process by which artificial uniformity becomes genuine diversity is haphazard and unnecessarily painful. By eliminating the need for this facade, we hope to make diversity apparent in the applicant pool, and thus supportive of variable admissions criteria.

Stanford only intensifies these pressures when we urge counselors to preselect our students, to encourage only those students whom they regard as "Stanford material" to apply. Preselecting must of course occur when admissions officers confer with counselors about applicants. But when preselecting makes the applicant pool shallow or narrow by eliminating students who do not seem to fit the stereotype, Stanford is the loser. Admissions officers may need to meet with students chosen by the counselor because they are thought to be admissable to Stanford. But when most of our recruiting is done in this manner, Stanford is again the loser.

Our point is not to criticize counselors; we believe that counselors are most valuable when they are counseling and far less valuable as evaluators or salesmen of their students to colleges. Nor would we avoid interviews between admissions officers and likely applicants, or recommend that the high school visiting program of our admissions staff be eliminated. We do assert that the task of preselecting is essentially disparate to the task of recruiting applicants who might, under flexible criteria for admission, benefit from and contribute to Stanford education. It is essential that the school visiting and interviewing activities currently being conducted be recognized as primarily preselecting—that is, the identification and encouragement of particularly promising candidates. We assume that, in the course of these school visits, it will continue to be appropriate to occasionally give an "on-the-spot" verbal commitment to accept a potential applicant. If the admissions procedures we have recommended elsewhere are implemented, this practice could be hazardous, at least initially. We therefore recommend that University commitments to accept particular applicants take place only in those cases where the applicant is so clearly outstanding that there is virtually no possibility of his not being accepted in the actual procedure.

Are There Alternatives?

In an effort to learn about recruiting practices elsewhere, inquiries were directed to 11 sister colleges and universities. The outstanding feature of the replies is that practices vary widely, but no one perceives what he is doing as being different from "common practice." Actual involvement in recruiting by potential recruiters—admissions officers, faculty, current students, and alumni—at these institutions ranged from high to almost non-existent. At

three eastern universities, for example, the recruitment officer's primary contact is with area alumni committees, which select the schools he is to visit that year. A California college, by contrast, makes no use of alumni in recruiting. Admissions officers of one institution do not recruit applicants, but rather visit the schools of promising students who have already applied; they report that these visits do seem to stimulate applications from the schools visited. Student participation in recruiting appears to be highest where one university's Undergraduate Schools Committees give campus tours, visit their home schools, and submit evaluations of applicants.

With reference to the schools examined, Stanford appears unique in burdening admissions officers with the entire load of recruitment and in the extent to which its other resources for recruitment are directed to persuading admitted applicants to attend Stanford. Our alumni groups give parties; our students and faculty members participate in the High School Day activities; our student groups, admissions officers, and other administrators write to "A-Letter" recipients. A new program being developed by our Alumni Office involves the appointment of current students to serve as "Student Associates" between Stanford (Alumni) Clubs and the campus. In 1968–69 there will be about 35 Student Associates; the eventual goal is one Student Associate for each of the 65 geographic areas in which there are clubs. The focus of activities by these Associates, as of those by alumni, is on persuading admitted students to enroll.[2] If students and faculty members, working in the framework of alumni clubs, can persuade admitted students to *attend* Stanford, surely they can also persuade students to *apply to* Stanford. We believe that they can elicit applications without engaging in the disparate task of preselecting. But if they or other recruiters are to attract to Stanford a more diverse and more flexible pool of applicants, Stanford must present itself as a university composed of and receptive to a wide variety of persons.

Stanford in Print

The Undergraduate at Stanford is mailed to all prospective applicants who request information about Stanford, and it is probably in the files of most high school college counselors. It exemplifies what Professor Albert Guerard

[2]In '68–'69 an attempt will be made to involve Student Associates in recruiting, especially in their hometown areas or areas not currently visited by our admissions officers.

calls "computer prose," slick, lifeless, public-relations language, which characterizes Stanford as "truly outstanding" in all respects—with the implication that Stanford is unique in no respect. In addition to the superlatives describing the University and its services, routine procedural information about applications, requirements, and financial aid is included. Statements like, "In its academic program Stanford strives to provide high quality education for all its students while giving the individual every chance to work to the fullness of his talent," do generalize about Stanford, but they hardly assist a prospective applicant to determine whether Stanford's "high quality education" is what he wants or needs. As Thresher notes, ". . .a general statement of a college's purpose is a task deceptively simple in appearance, which has defeated most authors of catalogue prose. Such statements are likely to have little practical bearing on the process involved in the 'great sorting' " (*College Admissions and the Public Interest*, p. 36).

This booklet fails to characterize either the undergraduate at Stanford or his undergraduate life. It is, in short, an artistic version of the *Stanford University Bulletin*, which applicants receive upon request. The *Bulletin* includes this statement of "personal qualifications":

> Social maturity, qualities of leadership, firmness of academic purpose, and indications of special abilities are marks of the educated individual, and are considered significant by the Committee on Admissions in the assessment of a candidate's personal record. This evaluation is accomplished primarily by means of the personal application form and the personal rating form.

We believe that cliches about the "marks of the educated individual" provide little help to the applicant in trying to evaluate his "fit." We note that the *Stanford Observer*, which depicts a lively University in a lively way, is a little-used resource for forming the applicant pool.

All of Stanford's propaganda can affect potential applicants by giving one or another impression of the University. No doubt different emphases are appropriate in material directed, say, to parents, faculty, or sister institutions. We believe that recruiting material should describe Stanford from students' viewpoints and that only a diversity of such viewpoints will enlist a diverse applicant pool. Instead of assuming that *most* potential applicants have other information sources available to them (which is probably true), our recruitment publication should address the potential applicant who knows nothing about Stanford and who will be guided by its contents in deciding whether or not to apply.

In addition to such standard-yet-diverse presentations of Stanford to potential applicants, we need a means to inform people about policies that call for changing emphases in the makeup of the student body. High school newspapers, the public press, and other media must tell the story soon when Stanford suddenly awakens to a need for expanding, say, students from minority groups. Quick information about new policies is best given by the office of University Relations through the News Service.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. Stanford should establish a Recruiting Council composed of representatives of students (including minority-group representatives), faculty, administration (Undergraduate Education and Admissions), alumni, and University Relations.

Recommendation 2. Under supervision of the Recruiting Council, Stanford students, together with younger faculty and recent alumni, should be given increasing responsibility for eliciting a wider range of applicants to the undergraduate student body. It is particularly important that minority-group students participate with other students in the recruiting effort.

Recommendation 3. Stanford should publicize the academic and social background characteristics of present students in a way that highlights diversity rather than homogeneity. This information should depict ranges of characteristics and not global profiles; supplementary anecdotal material should also be used.

a. The *Stanford University Bulletin* should be the primary procedural and resource explanation, revised annually to describe current projects and experiments, such as changes in living situations for undergraduates.

b. *The Undergraduate at Stanford* should be rewritten to characterize student interests, activities, and problems, as well as specific innovations, commitments, and healthy confrontations of opposing views, which contribute to campus dynamics.

c. At least one issue of the *Stanford Observer* should be mailed to every potential applicant who requests information about Stanford.

d. A new publication for all students and applicants should show that everybody at Stanford belongs simultaneously to several minority groups—

defined by race, age, rank, work, specialization, religion, politics, etc. This publication should be used for recruiting in high schools with large concentrations of minority-group students.

Conclusion

We believe that Stanford is a university of excellence because it holds plural interests in creative tension. No description of "average" people can portray Stanford. We wish to attract to Stanford applicants who are not average people and who know that Stanford is not a community of averages.

Our recommendations on forming the applicant pool are inseparable from our report Selection Procedures and Criteria. The Senate Committee on Admissions should be responsible for setting policy and defining it operationally in terms of specific competitions, selection standards, and desired proportions and types of achievement and non-achievement characteristics. Their decisions should consider, and be responsive to, a multiplicity of constituencies with different, perhaps conflicting, values they want supported by the undergraduate admissions policy. To implement the policy, the applicant pool must have enough students with the characteristics defined as desirable. The Recruiting Council should see its function as two-fold: 1) directing the recruitment effort so as to facilitate the implementation of policy; and 2) allowing the major constituencies a voice in deciding the operational elements of a recruitment program, such as personnel, publications, geographic coverage. For example, faculty representatives on the Recruiting Council might feel that certain characteristics not specifically included as selection criteria are highly desirable in applicants; it is then their responsibility to explore ways in which the recruitment program might increase the representation of these characteristics in the applicant pool.

We have expressed concern over the role of high school counselors, both in preselecting the applicants and in assessing their personal qualities. Our concern has undoubtedly been a major motivating factor for our recommendations that outside assessments make a strictly limited contribution to the selection procedure, that counselors be used as information sources about the achievements of the applicant, and that applicants be urged to assess their own potential in the light of information describing Stanford's goals and procedures, perhaps supplemented by a campus visit or a recruiter's high

school visit. Our basic premise is that regardless of the specific substance of our concerns about the high school counselor, a selection procedure should not require their heavy participation in order for the goals of the system to be achieved. The procedure we propose, specifically selecting applicants with outstanding achievement in any of a wide variety of areas, will, we think, result in a sufficiently broad and stimulating range of personality characteristics without requiring any attempt to deliberately select for these characteristics.

2. Selection Procedures & Criteria

Report of
the topic committee

Introduction & Assumptions

This Committee has been charged with the formulation of recommendations regarding procedures by which undergraduates should be selected for the Stanford student body and criteria on which these selections should be made. We have examined in detail existing criteria and practices; we have collected and analyzed data on the applicants for admission in 1966–67; we have also relied heavily on other studies of the Stanford student body, the Stanford applicant pool, and policy statements from Stanford and other universities.

The question of selection procedures and criteria is fundamentally a question of the kind of student body desired for Stanford. We cannot presume to answer this question in general, but we can examine some of the salient issues involved and make recommendations for dealing with some of the problems we raise.

An examination of the selection of high school students to be Stanford freshmen must consider certain assumptions. We make the following assumptions not because they characterize the present situation, nor because they are self-evident truths, but to simplify our discussion.

Assumption A
The applicant pool contains the appropriate proportion of individuals possessing the characteristics we desire to select.

The interdependence of selection criteria and the composition of the applicant pool is obvious: one cannot select for a criterion that is absent from the

pool of applicants. That our present applicant pool, under present selection criteria, does not meet our assumption was evident when Stanford attempted to select more minority-group students; there simply were not enough such applicants to obtain the desired number of students in the freshman class. The data in our report Forming the Applicant Pool illustrates other homogeneous features of the current applicant pool. That report also provides procedures for altering the composition of the pool.

Assumption B
The University wishes to select its own students rather than delegate this authority to any outside agency.

The basis for this assumption is in the amendments by Mrs. Stanford to the founding grant, "The University authorities are the sole judges of the qualifications of applicants for admission to any department of the institution." While the desirability of this position may be self-evident, it is not completely consistent with current practice. In view of the large number of highly qualified applicants for admission to Stanford, perhaps it is inevitable that some part of the selection process take place outside the University. We should, however, acknowledge this circumstance and exercise as much control as possible over external selection processes.

There is, for example, considerable evidence that the high school counselor is a major selector of Stanford students. This selection occurs in two ways: first, the counselor may encourage some students to apply and discourage others; second, for each student who applies, the counselor completes an evaluation form that plays a major role in Stanford's admissions decisions. This recommendation form, used by Stanford and many other universities and colleges, requires rating the applicant on 22 different characteristics, among them academic ability, motivation, sense of humor, warmth. The final three rating scales ask the counselor to make an academic recommendation, a character recommendation, and an overall recommendation; five categories are provided from "Do not recommend at all" to "Highest recommendation." In some cases, but not always, the counselor's ratings are a composite of ratings made by several of the applicant's teachers; it is not unknown for a counselor to mimeograph the rating forms and ask students to rate themselves.

Table I illustrates the relationship between the character recommendation, the predicted grade point average at Stanford, and the admissions decision based on projections from our sample data. Examination shows that very few

males and no females with a character recommendation at the third level or lower are admitted to Stanford, regardless of their grade point predictions. Even from the next to highest category, it is extremely difficult to be admitted, particularly for females.

Table I can be interpreted in two ways; either the character recommendation is very highly *correlated* with other selection criteria used by the admission staff, or it is a basis for admissions decisions. While the first interpreta-

TABLE I

RELATION OF CHARACTER REFERENCE AND GPA TO ADMISSION

MALES

Character Reference:	*Predicted Grade Point Average*							
1 (LOW)	*>2.99*	*>2.79*	*>2.59*	*>2.39*	*>2.19*	*>1.99*	*>1.79*	*<1.79*
Coming (871)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not coming (503)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rejected (3711)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Proportion rejected	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	100%
2								
Coming (871)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not coming (503)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rejected (3711)	0	0	0	0	15	15	30	15
Proportion rejected	–	–	–	–	100%	100%	100%	100%
3								
Coming (871)	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7
Not coming (503)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Rejected (3711)	0	45	104	45	119	104	74	74
Proportion rejected	–	100%	100%	81.8%	100%	100%	100%	91.3%
4								
Coming (871)	20	27	34	40	20	13	0	0
Not coming (503)	6	16	16	13	3	3	0	0
Rejected (3711)	0	74	223	312	267	371	104	104
Proportion rejected	0	63.2%	81.6%	85.4%	95.3%	95.8%	100%	100%
5 (HIGH)								
Coming (871)	34	248	181	101	74	40	20	7
Not coming (503)	68	142	97	74	55	3	3	0
Rejected (3711)	0	148	341	386	327	208	89	104
Proportion rejected	0	59.2%	55.0%	68.8%	71.7%	82.8%	79.4%	93.6%

FEMALES

Character Reference:	*Predicted Grade Point Average*							
1 (LOW)	*>2.99*	*>2.79*	*>2.59*	*>2.39*	*>2.19*	*>1.99*	*>1.79*	*<1.79*
Coming (417)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not coming (114)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rejected (2084)	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0
Proportion rejected	–	–	–	100%	–	–	–	–
2								
Coming (417)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not coming (114)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rejected (2084)	0	0	15	0	15	0	15	0
Proportion rejected	–	–	100%	–	100%	–	100%	–
3								
Coming (417)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not coming (114)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rejected (2084)	0	15	15	15	31	15	46	15
Proportion rejected	–	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4								
Coming (417)	6	12	18	6	0	6	6	0
Not coming (114)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Rejected (2084)	0	107	123	245	107	92	15	61
Proportion rejected	0	89.9%	87.2%	97.6%	100%	93.8%	71.4%	100%
5 (HIGH)								
Coming (417)	12	149	107	60	24	12	0	0
Not coming (114)	7	55	33	3	10	3	0	0
Rejected (2084)	0	169	307	322	199	61	61	0
Proportion rejected	0	45.3%	68.6%	83.6%	85.4%	73.4%	100%	–

tion cannot be ruled out because it is impossible to check all the relevant correlations, Table I does show cases of rejected applicants whose academic prediction is *not* correlated with character recommendation.

Our study further reveals positive correlations between every other rating scale and admissions decisions. Complete evaluation of the role of the counselor's recommendation form cannot be achieved without some sort of controlled experiment. It is clear, however, that at least in some cases the counselor's evaluations alone correlate with rejection of an applicant.[3]

[3]The Admissions Office has informed us that the Table I data do not take into account changes made in some applicants' predicted grade point averages in those cases where the applicant's seventh-semester grades did not support the prediction made prior to receiving this information.

Assumption C
The position of the University in the competition for desired high school graduates is equal to the job of attracting sufficient numbers of the students it desires.

With respect to this assumption, the Dean of Admissions has frequently said that the character of the freshman class would be different if those who were admitted to Stanford but enrolled elsewhere had chosen instead to come to Stanford. There seems to be evidence supporting his statement. In 1965, for example, of the 128 males in the top predicted grade point average group, 72 chose to enroll at schools other than Stanford. For every other prediction group, however, a majority of the students admitted chose to enroll. Thus while our competitive position may not be all that we desire, it permits a realistic belief that appropriate efforts can obtain substantial proportions of students in any category defined as desirable. The specific persuasion efforts that might be necessary lie beyond the scope of this report.

Assumption D
Admissions decisions are not dictated by financial considerations.

Our fourth assumption causes considerable difficulty. Obviously, the composition of the student body depends not only on the students selected but also on the students enrolled. Since attendance is very much dependent upon financial aid, admissions policies may require drastic alterations in financial aid policies (e.g., the decision to increase minority-group enrollment at Stanford). Once an admissions policy is firmly established, financial aid policy should be designed to promote the same goals. We omit considerations of financial aid here not because of failure to recognize their relation to admissions, but rather to simplify the exposition of the issues in selection policy.

Assumption E
Policy directives are sufficiently clear that the intent of policy is carried out as far as is reasonably possible.

In 1958, the Academic Council was charged with the responsibility of formulating admissions policy to be executed by the Dean of Admissions and his staff. Faculty concern about the implementation of the 1958 policies led the Humanities and Sciences Faculty Assembly to form an *ad hoc* committee on admissions policies and practices.[4] This *ad hoc* committee found it

[4]That Committee's study and personnel provided some continuity into the present study; however, to all intents and purposes, the SES project began its work *de novo*.

impossible to determine whether or not admissions practice was consistent with policy because of inconsistencies in the 1958 policy statement itself. Although the specific directives of 1958 were unambiguous, the guiding intent of the policy was nowhere recorded. Hence, there were no explicit principles to aid the admissions staff in adapting the details of administration to changing circumstances–for example, to the greatly improved academic quality of the applicant pool.

Assumption F
The personnel and financial resources required to execute any approved policy can be made available.

The recommendations we make in this report have implications for the activities of the admissions staff as well as for the cost of administering the policies. Some additional technical expertise will be required. It may be possible to obtain this technical assistance from resources already available in the University. The personnel and budgetary ramifications of our recommendations have not engaged this Committee; they were referred to a special subcommittee because we realize that they are important, but we have not asked that subcommittee to report through us.

Aspects of Present Policy

As background to our recommendations, we quote briefly from the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Admissions Policies and Practices of the Humanities and Sciences Faculty Assembly. (A fuller description and analysis of present admissions practice is contained in that report.)

> The admissions policies adopted by the Academic Council in 1958... [include] six points: (1) Applicants must meet the official minimum requirements for admissions or their substantive equivalent. (These requirements include minimum scores on the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test of 400 on both verbal and mathematical sections of the test, as well as certain prescribed high school courses.) (2) Each applicant is to be rated on a ten-point scale with points distributed as follows: High school grade point average, 4 points; SAT verbal, 2 points; SAT mathematics, 1 point; personal qualifications, 3 points. Applicants are to be ranked according to total rating and cut-offs determined by the Dean of Admissions. (3) Legacies may be admitted, provided their total rating is not more than one full point below the cut-off. (4) Sons and daughters of members of the Board of Trustees, the

faculty, and the permanent staff may be admitted without regard to the competitive process, provided they meet the requirements of (1) above. (5) All applicants must file complete credentials on or before the deadline date. (6) The Dean of Admissions, in consultation with the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions is authorized to act at his discretion with respect to 'borderline cases'; a 'borderline case' is defined as that of an applicant whose total rating falls as much as two points below the cut-off.

ADMISSIONS PROCEDURE

Each applicant submits an application form which includes background information on the candidate, a statement of the candidate's interests, and a complete listing of the activities in which he has participated during high school. The background information includes items such as father's name, education, and occupation, and mother's maiden name, education, and occupation. In addition, the applicant's high school submits transcripts of the student's grades, and the high school counselor or principal files a recommendation letter (on a form prepared by Stanford) which includes rating scales on the traits of energy, initiative, independence, originality, leadership, self-confidence, warmth of personality, sense of humor, concern for others, reaction to criticism, reaction to setbacks, respect accorded by classmates, and respect accorded by faculty. The student also submits two additional references, one from a high school teacher and one from a person not connected with the student's high school. Finally, the student takes the Scholastic Aptitude Tests and his scores are forwarded directly to Stanford.

The high school grade point averages and the SAT verbal and mathematical scores are employed via a computer to arrive at a predicted grade point average, based on a regression equation developed by Professor Oakford, in which these variables are used to predict the grade point average in the freshman year at Stanford. On the basis of predicted grade point average, applicants are sorted into eight groups. Males and females are treated separately throughout the admissions procedure so that there are eight groups for males and eight groups for females. Each group represents approximately one-half standard deviation. For example, in 1965 the top group for males has about 3% of the applicants and the second group 13%, while for females the top group represents 1% of the applicants and the second group represents 19%.

The personal rating (3 of the 10 points in the Academic Council's policy statement) is determined by one of the directors of admission. Academic Council policy states (1) that the recommendation of the principal or counselor as to the candidate's character, integrity, emotional stability, motivation for a college education, and future potential as a citizen, and (2) the candidate's interests, activities, and purpose in obtaining a college education are the basis for making this personal rating. The personal ratings are subjective and global. There are no explicit statements of criteria and no weights are set for particular factors. The member of the admissions staff who makes the rating has all the above mentioned information about the applicant in front of him in making the personal rating. Applicants are graded A, A–, B, B–, C, C–, D, and E. At the beginning of each year's processing of applications the entire admissions staff all read a small group of folders; the final personal

ratings are made by a single rater. For those applicants who have been interviewed by a member of the admissions staff there is a one-page report and evaluation by the interviewer in the applicant's folder, which is also used in arriving at the personal rating of the candidate.

When academic and personal rating scores have been assigned to each applicant, final admissions decisions are then made. The entire admissions staff meets each morning and processes approximately 200 cases. Cutting points are established and each folder is either in the Admit, Reject, or Judgment Area. In 1965, for example, the automatic admission area consisted, for men, of predicted-grade-point-average (PGPA) group I, A through C–; PGPA group II, A, A–, B; PGPA group III, A; for women, the area was PGPA group 1, A through C, and PGPA group II, A. The judgment area is that discretionary range provided by the Academic Council in 1953. It should be noted, however, that not all candidates in the Admission zone are admitted since the discretionary policy allows the admissions staff sufficient latitude to exercise judgment within the admitted area.

We have conducted extensive studies of students admitted and rejected under these policies and procedures. Using data on 825 applicants for the year 1966–67, we compared admitted students with the total applicant pool on various social and personal characteristics; we examined those characteristics in which the admitted students differed markedly from the total applicant pool; finally, we simulated several different admissions policies to see the effect of particular policies on the admitted class. These simulations convinced us of the feasibility of the recommendations we will present in the final section of this report.

Several studies (see the reports of Black, Lovell, and the student-faculty committee on admissions), including our own, have shown that present admissions policies do not produce as heterogeneous a student body as many constituencies desire. Our own studies indicate that the selection procedures themselves are not directly responsible for this circumstance, since many social background and interest characteristics of the students selected closely resemble those of the applicant pool. We believe, however, that the nature of selection procedures and the information publicly disseminated about these procedures strongly influence the applicant pool. We also believe that selection criteria and procedures that emphasize diversity are a necessary condition to obtaining a diversified applicant pool.

Another aspect of current practice deserving some attention is the "batting average" as an indicator of admissions performance. Like their counterparts in many other universities, Stanford admissions officers calculate the ratio of "acceptances" to "admits" and conclude that a high ratio in a given year indicates respectively high success. The point is made that, counterwise, this

index does not signify good accomplishment. Indeed, it is possible that the opposite is true. To quote one of our memoranda:

> Consider what must happen on applications to the top schools. Each applicant to Stanford has an application not only here but at other schools of comparable quality. Suppose for definiteness, although a little artificially, that each student has filed five applications—one to Stanford and four others to top-level schools. Now not all these applicants are equally good. The very best ones will be accepted by all five. The ones of marginal quality will be accepted by perhaps one of the schools, not necessarily Stanford, and rejected by the other four, etc. The very best applicants, then, are making a 20 percent contribution to the batting averages of the top five schools, because they are accepted at all five places, and turn down four of them, accepting one. The next to the bottom category are making a 100 percent contribution to the batting average, because they enroll at the one place that accepts them. Thus, high batting averages tend to be associated with the students who are accepted at fewer of the top schools and rejected by more of them. A high batting average is no indication, necessarily, of anything other than a tendency to admit students who were not accepted at places they like as well as Stanford—a very insecure measure of quality or of performance. The above model can't be exactly correct, but it probably embodies something near to the truth.

As these comments indicate, one would expect the most successful admissions policy, by identifying and admitting the most sought-after students, to have a relatively low batting average.

The Case for Diversity

Value Issues. Many different value positions impinge on choosing a student body. Faculty are concerned with the nature of students they teach[5]; students are concerned with their peers in the educational process; the administration is concerned with students' contribution to the smooth functioning of the institution; alumni are concerned with students' doing honor to their alma mater. Besides these understandable interests, other segments of society are increasingly concerned with questions of who shall be educated and what shall be their consequent obligation to society. These issues all relate to the

[5]This Committee studied the admissions characteristics of current undergraduates named by faculty as "desirable students." The major characteristics distinguishing named from unnamed students were high predicted and achieved grade point averages for the former group.

questions of who can contribute most to Stanford, who can benefit most from Stanford, and who will contribute most to society because of a Stanford education.

There are also, of course, less altruistic but nevertheless legitimate concerns of interest groups that their members be represented in the student body. Of course, not all interests of all constituencies are legitimate, for some may at times contradict the fundamental purposes of a university.

Diversity itself, however, is a valid university value: a diverse student body has greater educational benefit for each of its members than a homogeneous student body. The opportunity to interact with other students whose experiences differ markedly from one's own not only provides perspective and stimulation, but also allows a student to see the range of possibility in human experience. An often overlooked, collateral benefit of increased minority-group enrollment is that, in the presence of these students, other Stanford students may learn much about our society, which they otherwise might not have been able to learn.

Given many constituencies with legitimate and often conflicting concerns, we believe it is essential to recognize value conflicts and to institutionalize procedures for their reconciliation. We believe that the pluralistic nature of the University and of society, the potential for conflict among legitimate interests, and the institutional value of diversity all support—indeed require—our recommending that no single, uniform set of standards be applied to all applicants for admission to Stanford.

Technical Issues. Two kinds of technical issues are involved in the composition of the student body. First there is the general problem of assessment. How does one measure those characteristics one desires to have represented? For example, most people involved in assessing applicants to a university would regard as an important characteristic the ability to think critically and analytically. To date, however, there are no satisfactory methods for assessing this ability. The problem becomes more complex when one wants to assess *potential* ability for thinking critically. At the present state of our technical knowledge, this type of assessment is virtually impossible.

There is a danger that technical solutions may become implicit values. That is, a characteristic may be made a criterion only because we can measure it. If we assume that high school performance is assessable and that grades are a reliable measure of this performance, it is still possible that high school grades are not relevant to the values we wish to maximize in our student body. We do not argue that high school grades should be abandoned as a criterion, but only that their use should be compared with the use of other possible criteria.

Furthermore, we do not ask that criteria be adopted without regard to whether or not they can be reliably assessed. We argue against the adoption of a criterion only or mainly *because* it can be reliably assessed. Attention to the differences between technical and value solutions can stimulate ideas for new and better methods of assessment.

The second (and more difficult) kind of technical issue relates to the composition of an entire class. Even if we were able to assess individuals on all the valued traits, the question remains as to how to combine these individuals into a freshman class. Assume, for example, that we were solely concerned with maximizing academic performance at Stanford and that we decided to use previous academic performance as the basis of assessment. Would we want to select only those people at the top of the academic performance measures, resulting in a class composed solely of the highest high school academic performers? Such a class could conceivably depress the performance level of all. For example, if you compose a group of individuals, all of whom are high participants in group discussions, the performance of each individual in such a group will be depressed from his level of performance in more heterogeneous groups. We cannot, of course, generalize from simple group discussions to performance levels of an entire freshman class, but the example points out our concerns.

The state of knowledge regarding the effects of combining individual characteristics in large aggregates and the feedback effects of the aggregate makes it impossible to demonstrate that one form of composition is better than another. Hence, even if we could select one criterion to maximize, we would be reluctant to assert that homogeneous composition on that criterion would produce the desired results.

Conclusion. The range of values to be considered, the difficulties and attendant errors of assessment, and the absence of telling principles for the composition of a large aggregate all argue against homogeneous selection based on one criterion or set of criteria.

While technical issues are matters for experts, the reconciliation of conflicting values of various constituencies is a political problem, in the best sense of the term. The constituencies concerned with the composition of the student body should be taken into account. This does not mean, however, that every constituency must have its interests represented in the freshman class, for not every constituency has an equal stake. A mechanism is needed whereby a constituency can express its values and negotiate for the representation of these values. There should be a formal channel through which a constituency submits a proposal that certain types of students be admitted. Not every such

proposal would be accepted, but, hopefully, it would be possible to convince the constituency of the rationale for refusing its requests.

The Admissions Office presently reconciles the interests of different constituencies in a quiet and informal way. However, the ability to promote the acceptance of certain types of students is highly dependent upon access to the Admissions Office. We believe that a formal mechanism of access would benefit both the admissions staff and the interested groups. The admissions staff would thus be relieved of pressures coming from conflicting interested groups, and yet these groups would have a clear and open way to express their concerns.

Although concerned constituencies could, in the past, be clearly identified (primarily elements of the faculty, the alumni, and the University administration), we currently face various student constituencies, and we suspect that more constituencies will become vocal. Hence we believe it is imperative that those responsible for setting admissions policies be increasingly concerned with problems that are, in this sense, political.

These cited studies and considerations become the basis for our recommendations. We believe the recommendations confront and help to resolve the issues we have raised.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. Selection of students for freshman admission should be performed within many separate and distinct competition categories, each category defining a specific type of achievement. An applicant demonstrating competitive excellence in one such area should be accepted without reference to his rank position in other categories.

The present admissions policy uses a single, complex set of criteria for judging nearly all applicants in one grand competition. The policy set by the Academic Council in 1958 requires so large a number of subtle judgments for each applicant that to define standards for these judgments is difficult and to evaluate the implementation of the policy is impossible. Because these judgments are both complex and global, they become inherently subjective. The intention of the policy is to admit students who are outstanding academically and who have outstanding personal qualities, but, since personal qualities are many and varied, the identification of "outstanding" applicants involves com-

paring and weighing diverse and often incommensurable variables. The applicant who is outstanding as a scholar, athlete, student leader, musician, and everything else poses no problem, but the comparison of, say, the outstanding musician with the outstanding student leader is difficult if not impossible. Since the applicant who is outstanding in all respects is by definition rare, the problem becomes how to compare the applicant who is good in many things with the applicant who is outstanding in one respect and only average in the others. In the present "judgment area" as well as in the ratings of personal qualities, this problem is pervasive.

From another perspective, however, the exigencies of admissions practice have forced departures from a single competition with uniform standards. The applicants who are at the very top of PGPA are admitted regardless of their position on other variables. Those who are outstanding athletes, minority-group applicants, or children of faculty may be admitted provided they meet a minimal level of predicted academic performance, regardless of their positions on other variables. Thus, in practice, there are separate competitions for some categories of individuals. We believe that separate competitions are necessary not only because of the practical exigencies of admissions procedures, but because a wide diversity of values should be represented in the freshman class. The existence of separate competitions should be made explicit, the dimensions of individual characteristics defining each competition should be specified, and the standards of selection within each competition should be formulated.

We do not, however, propose simply recognizing *de facto* practice. Most admissions decisions are presently made in the context of a single competition based on global evaluations and a variety of implicit judgments. Such characteristics as the highest 5 percent of PGPA, athletic excellence, and affiliation (those applicants who are natural offspring of an alumnus or incumbent faculty member) are only a few of the many dimensions by which to define competitions. We recommend that the entire admissions procedure be in terms of separate and distinct competitions, which requires defining the dimensions of each competition and the criteria of selection for each competition.

To eliminate ambiguities, we should illustrate our conception of separate competitions. Suppose two defining dimensions are high school academic achievement and athletic excellence. Then from the first competition we select those applicants with the best high school records, and from the second we admit the best athletes. Two students may compete with each other in

both competitions, but in the first the sole basis of comparison between them is high school record, whereas in the second it is athletic performance. In no comparison between individuals A and B are both academic and athletic factors considered at the same time: we cannot choose to admit B in preference to A because, while A is slightly better than B academically, B is a much better athlete. In the academic competition, both may be admitted, both may be rejected, or A may be admitted and B rejected; but B will never be selected and A rejected. This is the significance of our recommendation that competition be in terms of one dimension and not across dimensions.

It may be desirable to admit students who are not at the very top on any single dimension but are nevertheless high on several dimensions. A procedure restricted to separate competitions on single dimensions would leave such students as "also rans." Hence, we recommend that one competition be defined for the "all-around" applicants (see p. 45).

The establishment of separate competitions involves three questions that should be examined: 1) What kinds of individual characteristics should form the basis of defining competitions? 2) What proportion of the entering class should be chosen from each competition? 3) Should there be a set of minimal requirements before an applicant can enter any competition? We look at each issue more closely.

1. Our illustration of three characteristics that are presently singled out for special consideration—academic performance, athletic excellence, and affiliation—points to an inherent problem in using characteristics to define competitions. It is quite clear how academic performance and athletic excellence can define competitions and how applicants can compete in terms of these characteristics. But how do applicants compete in terms of affiliation? If one speaks of the "best" applicant from faculty or alumni parents, "best" must be defined in terms of some other characteristics. Thus it is possible to segregate applicants that are affiliates and have them compete with each other on, say, academic performance. The general problem is that two kinds of individual characteristics enter into consideration in the process of admission. One of these is based on the performance and achievements of the individual, such as academic performance or musical talent, where it is possible to have individuals compete with one another and to order the competitors. In the second type of characteristic, it is not possible to define a competition either because the characteristic is unchangeable or because it takes on only a few values. Characteristics such as sex, affiliation, and minority-group membership exemplify the second type

that cannot be ignored in an admissions policy. We will refer to the first type as "achievement" characteristics and the second type as "non-achievement" characteristics.

We recommend that *achievement* characteristics form the defining dimensions for the separate competitions. Such non-achievement characteristics as should be represented in the student body for the good of the University or society, or for the sake of a legitimate constituency, should be treated in the same way as is a veteran's preference in Civil Service examinations. That is, an individual possessing a socially desired characteristic should receive "bonus points" in each of the competitions where it is practicable. The nature of the bonus (conditions under which it is given) and its size should be determined by the proportion of students with the given characteristic desired in the freshman class. We return to this issue later.

2. After defining the separate competitions, one must decide what proportion of the entering class should be admitted from each competition. These decisions will require great sensitivity to value issues as well as flexibility from year to year. Serious difficulties can be avoided by recognizing the need to evaluate regularly the Stanford experience of applicants admitted in a given competition and to readjust the proportions according to this experience.

The problem of setting proportions is further complicated by the non-achievement characteristics desired in the student body. Our remarks about flexibility and regular evaluation apply to these proportions as well, but the special problem here arises from the mechanics of operating an admissions procedure based on two overlapping sets of proportions. Suppose, for example, that the competitions are defined, the proportions to be admitted in each competition are fixed, and in addition it is decided that 20 percent of the entering class should be affiliates. How can this 20 percent be achieved without altering the proportions admitted in each of the competitions? Our solution is to give bonus points to applicants who are affiliates, but how does one know in advance the size of the bonus necessary to achieve a class with 20 percent affiliates? In general, the size of the bonus necessary to achieve the established proportion of a non-achievement characteristic cannot be predetermined. Hence, it is necessary to go through the entire admissions procedure several times, successively approximating the correct bonus. The use of a high-speed computer will make this process both feasible and straightforward; the computer will in no sense "admit students to Stanford," although the initial programming task requires considerable technical skill.

Since the actual selection aspects of the procedure are admirably suited to the use of computers, we digress to discuss this aspect of our recommendations. The employment of explicitly defined dimensions with clear cutting points (i.e., those necessary to achieve the established proportions) makes mechanization both practical and desirable. Mechanization insures consistent application of the criteria, whereas global-subjective judgment is variable and often inconsistent for unknown reasons. Judging human error to be no *desideratum*, we believe the consistent application of criteria will assure that defined policy is represented by the entering class and that the selection is fair to each individual applicant. Nor would the computer dehumanize the admissions process; choice of dimensions, evaluations of individuals on these dimensions, establishment of proportions, etc., are all tasks resting solely on human judgment. Assessment of particular outstanding talents, both in the *special talents* and *all-around* competitions (see c. and d. under *Recommendation 2*) must be done by the admissions officers; the results of their evaluations, in terms of awarded points for each applicant, would be fed into the computer to determine the effects of data on each applicant. Putting the final steps on the computer will only provide additional time for careful human judgment. The main danger to be guarded against in the use of computers is the danger of inflexibility. When a complaint is made against a "computer decision," the response is often, "We are sorry, but that is the way our computer is programmed." Such a response is indefensible. Either the criteria that determine the computer program have a defensible rationale or they are arbitrary; in neither case is the computer or the program to blame. We must program the computer with flexible options and reprogram when criteria change; failure to be human can only be the failure of humans, never that of machines.

3. Under present admissions procedures, certain categories of applicants are admitted provided they meet minimal standards. Since it is good neither for the individual applicant nor for the University to admit students who are likely to fail at Stanford, we believe that minimal standards are necessary. Our knowledge, however, of what factors greatly increase the risk of failure is quite limited; here the experience with experimental minority-group admissions should be useful in evaluating current views of minimum requirements. It should also be borne in mind that as the University changes programs and provides special services for problem students, what constitutes basic minimum abilities will change.

We recommend that minimum requirements be formulated in terms of what is necessary for a *reasonable chance of success at Stanford*. Obvious requirements would include a high school diploma, literacy in the English language, the absence of severe psychological problems, and a minimum level of predicted academic achievement at Stanford. We recommend elsewhere that the current prediction formula be revised and routinely evaluated; here we assume that whatever formula is developed will predict some form of grade point average. We have in mind that degree of screening that would currently be achieved by excluding those with predicted GPA's of less than 2.0 and with damaging personal ratings. Exceptions to any GPA cutoff should, of course, be made in those cases where there is reason to believe that such a measure is an inappropriate indicator of academic ability. We suggest that evidence bearing on these minimum requirements be treated as credentials to be evaluated for each applicant before that applicant enters any competition. We believe that applicants who fail this initial screening should be notified at once, and we see virtue in returning their application fees.

Recommendation 2. The Senate Committee on Admissions[6] should be charged with the responsibility for defining the following elements of the proposed procedure:

a. Minimum requirements, without which there is no reasonable chance of success at Stanford. Applicants not meeting these requirements would not participate in the competitions.

b. Achievement characteristics for each of the separate competitions; that is, specifying those types of achievement to be established as competition categories.

c. Selection standards for each competition category; essentially the operational definition of the different achievement levels to be assessed in each of the competition categories.

d. The proportion of students to be admitted from each competition.

e. The "non-achievement characteristics" to be accorded preference within certain specified competition categories.

[6]We speak of a Standing Committee on Admissions as defined by the Senate of the Faculty of Stanford University, under the authority of the Articles of Organization of the Faculty.

f. The proportion of admissions to be represented by each non-achievement category. This specification would determine the size of the bonus to be given for each non-achievement characteristic; within the limits of the applicant pool, a cyclical procedure would award bonuses of increasing size until the desired quotas were reached.

In order to familiarize the Committee on Admissions with the substance of our thinking on policy and procedures, we present here some more detailed suggestions, together with a sketch of how the procedures would work. We do this both to insure understanding of our recommendations and to provide an initial model of policy, which the Committee on Admissions can later modify. We emphasize that the procedure is here only outlined; many operational features need to be spelled out.

We recommend the establishment of four types of competitions, which we will term: 1) *random*; 2) *academic*; 3) *special talents*; and 4) *all-around*. Each one merits brief comment.

1. The rationale for a competition in which students are admitted on the basis of *random* selection from the applicant pool (after the screening for minimum requirements) is three-fold. First, it allows obtaining students with desirable characteristics that cannot be reliably assessed at the time of application and hence are not set up as separate competitions. Second, it forms a statistically reliable sampling of the applicant pool as a segment of the student body. Third, it provides a base line against which to evaluate the groups selected through the use of specified characteristics. If, for example, the Stanford experience of the group of students selected purely at random did not differ from the group selected because they had the highest predicted grade point averages, this would be extremely important in adjusting future admissions proportions.

2. In University admissions, the establishment of *academic* competitions hardly needs justification. Suffice it to say that students admitted through this competition must have shown by past performance the ability to benefit from and contribute to education at Stanford. It should be noted, however, that the students admitted in this competition will not be a homogeneous group so that many of these admissions will help the University to realize other values as well.

3. In the *special talents* competitions, we envision admitting to Stanford a group of students who can contribute to the University a wide range of outstanding abilities in the arts, the sciences, community service and public affairs, and athletics. We desire students who have

demonstrated truly outstanding achievements in one of these areas; in these competitions, we do not seek well-rounded individuals but expect that a well-rounded student body will result from a collection of individuals with differing areas of excellence.

4. Recognizing that individuals who are not truly outstanding in any one area of endeavor can also contribute to the University and to society—and certainly can benefit from the University—we recommend that the fourth type of competition be based on the range of interests and activities of the applicants. This competition should be more discretionary than the others, particularly in meeting desired proportions for non-achievement characteristics. We see merit in allowing a certain number of points for "valuable experiences," such as extensive travel and unusual summer work activities. The evidence of these experiences should indicate that they were not only uncommon but also valuable. For such characteristics, the statements of outsiders who know the applicant well are probably more useful than self-appraisals.

Although we feel that the use of outside assessments of an applicant's character must be carefully controlled, we see a place for such assessments beyond the initial screening. Assessments of character should be used as *information*, where the value of the information depends upon its relevance to admissions criteria and the extent to which it is supported by demonstrable evidence. For example, we would support the use of a question such as the following, in place of the current rating scale in the counselor's recommendation form: "In the applicant's high school career, what evidence have you seen of personality characteristics that you feel would significantly heighten the applicant's ability to contribute to and benefit from a Stanford education?" *We recommend* that the information received play a limited role in the all-around competition; that a certain number of points be allowed in this competition for strong evidence of desired characteristics; and that the maximum number of possible points should contribute no more than one-quarter to the total number of possible points in the all-around competition. Finally, since we continue to have grave doubts about the general utility of outside personality assessments, we urge that when sufficient data has been accumulated, careful study be made of the contribution of this dimension of the admissions procedure.

We recommend that, as a start, 10 percent of the entering class be students from the *random* competition, 50 percent from the *academic* competitions, 20 percent from the *special talents* competitions, and 20 percent from the *all-around* competition. Any single applicant could be selected more than once; to the extent that this occurs, filling the quotas will not fill the freshman class but will identify especially desired applicants. We return to this point later.

Because of problems of assessing academic performance, *we recommend* three separate academic competitions–one based on predicted grade point average, one based on scores on the verbal section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test, and one based on the mathematics section of the SAT. *We recommend* that 40 percent of the entering class be chosen from PGPA, 5 percent from SAT-verbal and 5 percent from SAT-math.

Similarly, special talents admissions involve several distinct competitions; *we recommend* grouping these into four classes and choosing 5 percent of the freshmen from each class. The classes would be: 1) fine arts, for example, music, art, sculpture, poetry; 2) science–all sciences, math, and engineering; 3) athletics–all sports in which Stanford has programs; and 4) community service and public affairs–organizational and political work, journalistic achievement, oratory, etc. The specific achievements that make up each of these classes remain to be spelled out; it is certainly not our intention to limit these to our specific examples.

We recommend that bonus points be assigned in the academic and all-around competitions to the following non-achievement characteristics: affiliates, minority-group members, those who seek no financial aid from Stanford (if the financial needs of the most desired applicants require such a bonus), and, in certain circumstances, sex (see below). It is not practicable, as we pointed out, to assign bonuses in the random or special talents competitions.

Let us elaborate in skeleton (if technical) form the way in which the procedure would operate.

Step 1: All applications would be screened for those who do not meet the minimum standard of a reasonable chance to succeed at Stanford.

Step 2: Those applicants who survive the initial screening would be numbered from 1 to k (where k = the size of the applicant pool).

Step 3: Each applicant is given a number from 1 to k, which corresponds to his rank on predicted grade point average.

Step 4: Each applicant is given a number from 1 to k, which corresponds to his rank on SAT-verbal aptitude score.

Step 5: Each applicant is given a number from 1 to k, which corresponds to his rank on SAT-math aptitude score.

Step 6: Admissions staff score all applicants on each of the special talents categories (there may be as many as 30 or 40 of these), according to the following degrees of demonstrated achievement:

1. Truly outstanding achievement (e.g., written work published in a national magazine).

2. High but not outstanding achievement (e.g., state honorable mention in football).

3. Average achievement (e.g., editor of high school newspaper).

4. No demonstrated achievement.

Step 7: Each applicant is given a number from 1 to k, which corresponds to his rank on a composite all-around potential score, obtained by summing scores achieved in Steps 3–6, information from the application form (see *Recommendation 4*), and the applicant's references.

Step 8: Each applicant is given a "1" for each non-achievement characteristic that he possesses.

Step 9: Each applicant is given a "1" if rated by the President or the Trustees as absolutely to be admitted.

Step 10: A computer is then assigned the following tasks:

a. Admit on a random basis some number of applicants, such that 10 percent of those who actually enroll were chosen from this competition. The number will have to be determined on the basis of experience with respect to the ratio of those admitted to those who actually enroll at Stanford. We will discuss this further below; for the present, in order to simplify presentation, we will use the proportions of the enrolled class rather than the larger and unknown proportion of applicants to be selected in a given competition.

b. Admit all who received "1" on any dimension of Step 6 up to 5 percent in each of the four classes of special talents, and up to a maximum of 5 applicants who receive "1" on the same special talent.

c. Assign trial bonus points, starting with zero, for each "1" assigned in Step 8, the non-achievement characteristic preferences.

d. Combine these bonus points with the applicant's rank in Step 3, Step 4, and Step 5 and with the applicant's rating from Step 7.

e. Admit the top 40 percent from the PGPA plus bonus competition.

f. Admit the top 5 percent from the SAT-verbal plus bonus competition.

g. Admit the top 5 percent from the SAT-math plus bonus competition.

h. Admit the top 20 percent from the all-around rating plus bonus competition.

i. Admit those with a "1" in Step 9 who have not already been admitted.

j. Calculate the proportion of each non-achievement characteristic in the admitted group. If they meet the desired proportions, the job is finished. If not, the computer is instructed to recycle beginning with d. assigning new trial bonus points.

A program currently operating at Stanford, whereby applicants of outstanding potential receive early notification of their acceptance, is readily adaptable to the recommended procedure. Provided that the early acceptance date is after the application deadline,[7] it would be feasible to identify these outstanding applicants in terms of the number of times that they are accepted in the course of the selection procedure. Also, the current "wait list" procedure can be easily built into the proposed system.

Some difficulties will undoubtedly be encountered in transition from a system of continual assessment and selection as applications are received to a system in which all selection occurs at a relatively late date, after the application deadline. We think these difficulties can be surmounted by careful planning and mechanical aids, but they should be anticipated.

Regarding the use of sex as a selection criterion, it seems clear that Stanford's current policy is anachronistic and arbitrary. We recommend that, in general, the admissions procedure disregard the sex of the applicant. We also recommend, however, that the proportion of males enrolled be between 60 percent and 75 percent.[8] Therefore, if the first round of admissions produces a ratio outside this range, bonus points for sex should be assigned prior to recycling. Similarly, if the application of an academic prediction formula produces a ratio outside this range, corrective bonus points should be assigned by sex.

[7]Verbal commitments made prior to this date are discussed in our report Forming the Applicant Pool.

[8]The eventual impact of such a change would be, of course, to increase the proportion of female applicants who are admitted. (Given the ratio of the current applicant pool, we would not expect the increase to be immediate.) An immediate shift to perhaps 33 percent females admitted could be anticipated, as contrasted with the present figure of 27 percent. The impact of such a shift on campus housing should be considered.

In the special talents competitions, problems can arise if there are either too many or too few outstanding applicants to attain the desired 5 percent in, say, the community service and public affairs class of competitions. If there are too many outstanding applicants, it may be advisable to choose randomly from those rated as outstanding. If there are too few, we believe that the list of talents should be expanded instead of lowering the criterion of demonstrated outstanding achievement. That is, *we strongly oppose* admitting those with "2" ratings in this competition as essentially inconsistent with the desire to obtain students with *outstanding* demonstrated achievement. In any event, these proportions should be flexible on the view that a dearth of particular kinds of outstanding talent in one year can be compensated for in the next.

The special talents competitions are *not* designed to fill certain places in organized activities at Stanford, such as the baseball team or the symphony orchestra. It is conceivable (but unlikely) that in a given year all the outstanding athletes admitted in this competition would be left-handed pitchers and all the musicians bassoonists. The point is to admit applicants who have demonstrated by achievement that they are outstanding in their special talent. Should this proposal hamper Stanford's efforts to compete in Pacific Eight athletics, we answer only that an admissions policy cannot be predicated on a university's competition in big-time athletics. If, after our policy's effect on athletics is felt, additional athletes must be admitted, we believe that those admissions can honestly be carried out only under Step 9 (admission by Presidential fiat).

We have discussed the procedures in terms of proportions of the freshman class rather than proportions of applicants admitted. To achieve the desired proportion of the entering class, the proportion of admissions will have to vary from competition to competition. The ratio of enrolled students to admitted applicants will differ for the different competitions. Experience alone will provide the basis for deciding how many to admit in a given competition in order to achieve the appropriate proportion of people chosen in that competition. Existing data can provide helpful information, if finer breakdowns than the overall ratio of enrolled-to-admitted applicants are examined. It is clear, however, that initially there must be considerable flexibility both in the size of the class that enrolls and in the degree of approximation to the proportions established for each competition. This is one area in which more thought and more analysis of previous experience is needed.

Prior to implementing the procedure we propose, two simulations should take place. First, an attempt should be made, using current applications information, to apply the procedure, say, to applicants for the freshman class of

1968–69. This simulation would identify to a limited extent the ways in which the recommended procedure would diverge from the current procedure. Of course, where different students would be accepted, it would be impossible to determine whether or not they would have enrolled, and thus the actual impact could only be estimated. Second, in the transition year both procedures should be used, the current procedure acting as a safeguard against disaster with the new procedure. If disaster is avoided, the current procedure will have been simulated.

Recommendation 3. The Senate Committee on Admissions should be the primary policy-making body with respect to admissions. It should be charged with the responsibility of being responsive to all constituencies with legitimate concerns about the nature of the undergraduate student body. It should also periodically assess and redefine competition categories and preference characteristics on the basis of accumulated experience.

The Academic Council Committee on Admissions has served primarily in an advisory capacity to the Dean of Admissions and to its own parent body. We believe that a more active role for this Committee would benefit both the admissions staff and the concerned constituencies. As the principal policy-making body, this Committee would provide an open channel for expression of legitimate desires and interests and would relieve the admissions staff of numerous and conflicting informal pressures. The informal expression of these pressures makes them appear illegitimate. It is our intention that the Committee consider itself an arbiter of conflicting interests, all of which are to be treated as legitimate, though not necessarily implemented.

The primary function of the faculty committee, however, should be the making of policy and the regular evaluation of that policy. One of the difficulties with the Academic Council's policy statement of 1958 is that it was not subjected to systematic evaluation at regular intervals. Thus, while it may have initially served the purposes of those who framed it, the changing circumstances of the University and of the college-going population of the country have rendered that policy obsolete.

We recommend that the program as a whole be treated experimentally, and we ask the Committee to accumulate the necessary experience, data, and expertise to evaluate its various features. We assume that the rapid changes in our society as well as the improvement of assessment techniques will necessitate redefining the competitions in which, and altering standards against which, applicants compete. For example, we have defined two competitions

in terms of SAT-verbal and SAT-math scores; our aim is to admit talented students whose high school grade point averages do not reflect their abilities. There is some question, however, whether high scores on these tests are reliable discriminators. We have suggested these competitions in order to provide a way to evaluate the use of SAT scores in admissions procedures, not in order to prolong dependence on SAT scores.

We have defined another competition on the basis of predicted grade point average, although we recognize great difficulties with the prediction formula currently used. Freshman grade point average, predicted by the current formula, is becoming an increasingly irrelevant criterion as the University curriculum and particularly the freshman curriculum change. Thus, the type of performance predicted should be reassessed. The current prediction formula uses linear techniques where non-linear models might improve the quality of the predictions made. (For a fuller discussion of this problem, see the report of the Humanities and Sciences *Ad Hoc* Committee on Admissions Policies and Procedures.) Use of the formula results in heavy weighing of high school grade point average[9]; we believe that other components of academic performance could improve the prediction formula. Certain procedures currently used by the admissions staff to equalize high school grades from a large variety of schools should also be systematically built into the prediction formula (e.g., the school's "college-recommending" grade, which can vary widely). Consideration should be given to the importance of the applicant's seventh-semester grades, the strength of the college-preparatory curriculum, and the depth and breadth of the applicant's own program. It may be desirable to include some or all of these factors in the prediction equation.

While we recommend that predicted GPA be the basis of a major competition, we do so on the assumption that this formula will be revised before it is used and that these revisions will include changing the criterion predicted, substituting non-linear for linear prediction and reckoning new predictor variables.

Recommendation 4. The application form should briefly describe the admissions procedure, specify the competition categories and selection criteria, and elicit information directly relevant to the competitions. The form itself should be a reliable indicator of Stanford's goals.

[9]For 1968–69 applicants, high school grade point average is weighted .62 for males and .71 for females.

All our recommendations aim at obtaining students who by virtue of their talents and achievements can contribute to Stanford and can benefit from a Stanford education in contributing to society. We believe that the applicant should be encouraged to think about Stanford in these terms. What does he have to offer to Stanford? What does Stanford have to offer him? What clear evidence can he and his references present in his behalf?

An image of Stanford is conveyed by the kinds of questions Stanford asks of its applicants, and this image undoubtedly affects the applicant pool. Asking only those questions relevant to specific achievement and non-achievement categories will greatly promote an accurate image of Stanford's interests.

Procedures aimed at diversifying the student body cannot succeed without diversifying the applicant pool. We believe that many potential applicants are discouraged by their own stereotypical conceptions of the Stanford student or the admissions process. These stereotypes can be weakened by the wide dissemination of information relating to the characteristics of current students (see foregoing discussion of the applicant pool), and the procedures by which selections are made.

Of course, no accepted applicant should be informed of the competition(s) in which he was successful. Nor should the applicant's high school officials or other references be given this information, except perhaps in the rarest circumstances. In all competitions except *special talents*, selection of an applicant depends more upon his relative position in the competitions than upon the absolute magnitude of his scores or indices. Since the competition categories and the proportions desired from each category can be expected to change, perhaps frequently, publicizing such information could cripple our capacity to implement the changes.

Another potentially sticky area is the publicizing of non-achievement characteristics as well as competition categories and selection criteria. We see no danger in specifically identifying those characteristics for which bonus points will be awarded. It will be noted in the brief description of the selection procedure that in the first selection cycle, all bonus points will be equal to zero; non-achievement characteristics will receive non-zero bonuses only if the desired quotas have not been achieved (or have been exceeded) on the first cycle. Thus applicants can be told that *in certain circumstances* the presence of such characteristics can increase their chances of being accepted. Currently the desired non-achievement characteristic most likely to be in short supply in the applicant pool is minority-group membership.

With respect to the recommendation form currently completed for most applicants by their high school counselors or teachers, we recommend that it be redesigned to include the following: 1) questions aimed at identifying applicants whose personality eccentricities preclude a reasonable chance of success at Stanford; 2) specific questions relevant to the all-round competition, in which highly desirable personality traits and "valuable experiences" may contribute to an applicant's score; and 3) questions that elicit information about the applicant's outstanding achievements that are relevant to competition categories.

3. Transfer Admissions

Report of
the topic committee

Background

Stanford currently admits between 50 and 75 female transfer students each year and between 200 and 300 male transfer students. Approximately two-thirds of these students enter as sophomores; one-third enter as juniors. These numbers are subject to considerable yearly fluctuation. The females are chosen from a pool of approximately 400 applicants; the males from a pool of about 600. The number of females accepted has traditionally been determined by the number of beds available; this is no longer so true, as there is some flexibility in determining how many beds are available for them, but housing is still a prime determinant of the number of female transfers.

Female transfers are guaranteed housing on campus (at least until this year), but male transfers are neither guaranteed housing nor is housing typically available for them. Scholarship aid is not currently available for transfer students, with the exception of a few students from junior colleges.

Approximately 80 transfer students are admitted each year under special circumstances or to a special program. About 20 females are admitted to the nursing program; they receive a Stanford degree and live in undergraduate women's housing. Between 20 and 30 students are admitted under the "T-letter" program, in which students who do not qualify for admission as freshmen but are deemed politically desirable admittees (e.g., legacies) receive a letter that guarantees them admission if they can maintain a 3.0 average at

some other school ("college") for one year. About 15 students are admitted each year because of athletic prowess. About 12 are admitted to the School of Engineering under a "3:2" program in which they attend a liberal arts college for three years (typically Claremont) and then attend Stanford for two years, receiving degrees from both schools. A few students are admitted under a similar program run in conjunction with a Norwegian preparatory school. The remainder of the transfers are admitted on essentially the same basis as the freshmen, although the predicted GPA is replaced by a prediction based on their performance in the college they have attended, adjusted on the basis of past performance at Stanford by students from that college.

The quality of student admitted as a transfer seems to be far lower than that of incoming freshmen. It is especially true that the percentage of low ability students is far higher among transfers. For example, in the class of 1968, 47 percent of those students admitted as transfers had an SAT-verbal score of below 600. Only 15 percent of those students admitted as freshmen had SAT scores that low. The comparable figures for SAT-math are 40 percent and 17 percent.

The transfer students also perform less well at Stanford: 11 percent of the males and 7 percent of the females are failing at the end of their sophomore year. A student admitted as a freshman is almost twice as likely to be mentioned by some faculty member as one of his three "ideal" students as is a student admitted as a transfer.

Of the transfer students admitted last year, 58 percent were from four-year colleges, while the remainder were from junior colleges, primarily in California. The percentage from junior colleges has increased over the last four years from 27 percent to 42 percent. The performance of these two groups of students differs dramatically. The GPA achieved in the first year was 2.92 for students from four-year colleges, almost identical to that achieved by students from high schools. On the other hand, students admitted from junior colleges had an average GPA of 2.65. Students from California junior colleges had an average GPA for the years 1964–67 (based on a total of 391 students) of 2.56. Students from Menlo College had an average GPA for the years 1964–67 (based on a total of 99 students) of 2.34. This latter figure is by far the lowest figure we have ever observed for any group of students, no matter how defined.

Transfer students are treated very badly at Stanford. Males are not eligible for on-campus housing and must seek out private housing in a strange community. Many of them feel as a result that they are never fully integrated into the University. In addition, they are ineligible for, or miss out on, most of the

innovations in Stanford undergraduate education, both educational and social. For example, they do not benefit from the Freshman Seminar Program. They typically cannot live in coeducational housing; they cannot live in the experimental dormitories with special education programs. Many are so poorly qualified academically that they must struggle just to stay in school.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. Admission procedures for transfer students should be altered to correspond to the recommended procedures for freshmen.

We note that it may be impossible to follow those recommendations in every detail, but the spirit of those proposals can certainly be implemented. We note also that our report on Undergraduate Financial Aid includes a recommendation that transfer students be treated identically to freshmen in offering financial aid. We note finally two important possible exceptions to the above recommendation: the first dealing with the special program transfer students mentioned above; the second dealing with minority groups. It seems reasonable that the "T-letter" program be continued; it seems to fulfill a needed political function and provides a method of assessing a little more accurately which of these marginal students can succeed at Stanford. The "3:2" program seems reasonable to continue. Transfer athletes and applicants to the nursing program should be admitted by the same criteria as those outlined for freshmen. It is noted in our report Minority-Group Students at Stanford that junior colleges may provide good places from which to recruit additional minority students; this report concurs.

Recommendation 2. With the exception of certain special programs, transfer students should possess no less academic potential than incoming freshmen.

There is no reasonable defense for admitting a transfer student who is far below the caliber of a freshman who was rejected at the same time. Since the transfer student is likely to face more difficult problems in academic adjustment he should have more rather than less ability if he is to compete on even terms. Finally, there seems no reason to want transfers unless they are of uncommon ability. Stanford's educational program (insofar as it has one) is a four-year program designed to be such. The student who misses a major

portion of that program is not benefitting maximally from what Stanford offers.

Recommendation 3. All transfer students should be guaranteed on-campus housing for their first year at Stanford if they desire it.

This recommendation follows directly from the observation that transfer students have serious difficulty integrating into the University community, and that as a result of being denied housing they are ineligible for many of the unique offerings of the University. Although in one sense this recommendation may seem to be tangential to admissions considerations, we seriously doubt that any transfer students should be admitted if this recommendation is not implemented. Otherwise, Stanford will be creating two classes of citizens within the undergraduate community.

In conclusion we note that application of these recommendations would probably reduce the number of transfer students admitted, given the present applicant pool, by more than 50 percent. We applaud this reduction. Should the recommendations result in a shift in the nature of the applicant pool such that the number of transfer students begins to rise again, serious thought must be given to the question of the desirability of a large number of transfer students in a four-year institution.

4. Minority-Group Students at Stanford—An Interim Report

Interim report of the topic committee

It is no easy matter to prescribe the kind of student body a university ought to have. Not the least of the difficulties involved is to decide who can make the prescription. Many interests have a claim to be heard—faculty, surely, trustees, administration, alumni, students in residence, the larger society of which the institution is a part. To enumerate them is to suggest the difficulty without approaching the question of what weight is to be assigned to the voice of each.

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid of the Study of Education at Stanford here reports its interim findings concerning minority-group students. In the simplest and most general terms, the questions to which we address ourselves are: what is Stanford now doing? What should Stanford be doing? How can Stanford do what it should be doing?

The key question, the second of those, is at its root a value question. Its answer for any person must rest on a conception of the nature of this University and its responsibilities. To these essential questions there are many possible and several viable answers. Naturally, we hope that our answers will command support. More important, though, we hope that they will elicit comment, discussion, controversy, and any other ingredient necessary to move the University forward.

The Situation at Stanford

Stanford has long been a white, middle- and upper-middle-class university. This fact does not distinguish it from any other leading American private college or university or from most public ones. No history has been written of the involvement of minority-group students in higher education for the good reason that there is no history to write. It is a non-history. When it is written, the meat of the story will surely begin in the 1960's. For practical purposes, it is in this decade that Stanford's story, too, begins. For the same purposes, we believe that the Negro students' story is a model for the story of students from other minority groups. As Stanford learns to do justice by Negro students–justice to itself and to its society as well–we will simultaneously learn how we may do justice by other minority-group students.

Table I

Table I shows the history since 1960 of Negro freshman applications and admissions.

	Applicants	*Admitted*	*Rejected*	*Coming*	*Not Coming*
1960	6	3	3	2	1
1961	No record	6	No record	6	0
1962	No record	No record	No record	No record	No record
1963	No record	15	No record	15	0
1964	21	16	5	10	6
1965*	54	33	20	22	9
1966*	92	51	41	35	15
1967*	114	52	55	37	15

*Minor discrepancies in data supplied by the Admissions Office.

It is clear from this table that the freshman class of 1965 was a kind of watershed at Stanford. Applications more than doubled, as did the number of Negroes admitted and the number enrolling. This increase was largely the result of energetic recruitment by the Admissions Office. The class entering in 1966 showed impressive numerical gains, although not so large percentage increases. The present freshman class was drawn from a larger number of applicants, but the admission and enrollment of Negro students increased only marginally over the previous year.

Table II

The best present estimate of minority enrollment at Stanford this year (1967–68) is shown in Table II. These figures were reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as required under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (They are estimates, based largely on personal knowledge and visual inspection. In 1968, a census-type reporting system will be required.)

	American Negro	*Other Minorities*
Undergraduate	100	175
Graduate Humanities & Sciences	12	9
Graduate Engineering	5	39
Education	22	34
Business	4	0
Earth Sciences	0	5
Law	3	8
Medicine	2	12
Total	148	282

Table III

In a rapidly shifting situation it is probably not possible to identify with confidence a representative year. We focus on the Negro freshmen who entered in autumn 1967, to establish a baseline against which to judge policy and practice for the future.

Negro Freshmen — Autumn 1967

	Median Verbal	*Median GPA*
Admitted and coming (36)	573	3.68
Applied and not accepted (56)	519	3.38
Admitted and not coming (15)	601	3.91
Whole class (1291)	653	3.88

Several things are striking about these data. When they are used in conjunction with Table I, it is clear that the admission of Negro students has become more selective, judged by admissions compared to applications. We believe that this is largely the result of more vigorous recruiting efforts aimed at schools in which Negro students are likely to be found. We have no basis for judging whether the increase in applications should have produced a larger number of admissions. It is worth noting, however, that Wesleyan University,

which has one of the most vigorous and successful programs for recruiting minority-group students, shows a similar pattern: in 1966, 53 such students were admitted out of 119 applicants (33 enrolled), and in 1967, 62 were admitted out of 178 applicants (39 enrolled). It is probably true that in any institution with a fixed class size, growing numbers of applicants will produce greater selectivity in total and in specific groups.

The second striking fact about Table III is the distribution of SAT scores. We are aware of the widely claimed assertion that the Scholastic Aptitude Tests are culture bound and discriminate against minority-group students. We do not dispute that claim. We simply note that Negro applicants, while having generally lower scores than Caucasian students, performed quite creditably.

Table IV

To add some depth to the picture, Table IV shows the distribution of SAT scores at 100-point intervals. One should not make direct connections between SAT scores and admissions decisions, because many other factors enter into the final decision. Yet to the extent that SAT scores played a part in these decisions, it is fair to conclude that greater weight was given to verbal aptitude than to mathematical. Only 2 students out of the 18 who had verbal aptitude scores in the 600–700 range were not admitted. while 8 of 21 in the same range on mathematical aptitude were not admitted. At the lower end of the scale a low verbal score appears to be a somewhat greater deterrent to admission than is a low mathematical aptitude.

	Verbal		
	Not Admitted	*Admitted Not Coming*	*Admitted Coming*
700–800	0	1	4
600–700	2	6	10
500–600	28	7	15
400–500	20	1	7
300–400	6	0	0

	Math		
	Not Admitted	*Admitted Not Coming*	*Admitted Coming*
700–800	0	0	3
600–700	8	6	7
500–600	21	7	12
400–500	22	2	12
300–400	5	0	2

Stanford's Dean of Admissions has reported to the Academic Council that minority-group students are judged essentially "outside the competition." That is to say they, like athletes and children of faculty members, must meet the University's basic entrance requirements, but they need not be more qualified than all rejected applicants. The data presented here support this description of the process.

Survival rates for Negro students appear quite respectable. Of the 22 enrolled in autumn 1965, 18 were enrolled in autumn 1967, a survival rate of 82 percent, compared with the overall rate for the class of 86 percent. Their mean GPA was 2.46; only one of the 18 was on probation.

The Experience of Other Universities and Colleges

We present information about other colleges and universities for two reasons. First and more important, we may learn from the experience of others. Second, it seems useful to compare Stanford's performance and practices with those at other institutions. We do not justify Stanford's record by comparing it with others. Even if we were to conclude that Stanford does a better job of recruiting minority-group students than does any other institution, it would not follow necessarily that we are doing a good job, much less all that we ought to be doing. Those questions turn finally on how we conceive of ourselves and of our role as a university; they are not answerable by reference to any other institutions.

The first thing to say about reports on efforts of many other institutions to recruit minority-group students is that they are characterized by extraordinary rhetoric. Performance rarely matches the rhetoric. The cases that follow are not exhaustive, but they are probably representative.

1. *Wesleyan University*. Wesleyan has one of the most impressive programs in the country. Their "special minority-group admissions" include Negro, Puerto Rican, American Indian, and poor, white students. An intensive recruiting effort has brought remarkable results: in 1964, two students in those groups enrolled in the freshman class, 0.7 percent of the class. In 1967, 39 students enrolled, 10.9 percent of the class. The Wesleyan admissions office reports that in 1964 it contacted about 45 special minority-group students; by 1967 the number who had been contacted either in person or by mail had

reached 1,800. Over the years, admissions have become more selective. In 1965, 27 were admitted out of 44 who applied; in 1966, 53 of 119 were admitted; and in 1967, 62 of 178. In 1967, when no student with an SAT-verbal score below 400 was admitted, 28 of the 62 scored between 500 and 600, and 26 scored between 600 and 800. The Wesleyan group in 1967 had somewhat lower verbal scores and somewhat higher math scores than the Stanford group, but the differences are not marked. On the basis of SAT scores, the Wesleyan and Stanford groups are quite similar.

2. *Harvard.* Harvard's major effort in the field of minority-group recruitment is called the "Risk-Gamble Program," perhaps to emphasize its daring quality. It appears to be characterized more by very careful recruitment and evaluation than by significant risks or gambles. The following statement from the Harvard Admissions Office describes the basis of recruitment:

> Establishing and developing selection criteria has presented obvious problems, and there is only one generalization that can easily be made about how we have tried to operate. This is that we have looked for unusually impressive young men from severely disadvantaged backgrounds who have done so far with their lives all that could reasonably have been asked of them to do, given the circumstances of their schooling and up-bringing. Regardless of how fine we think they are as human beings, they must also demonstrate the academic potential to earn three C's and one D each term in a program of average difficulty here, and determining this produces some of our biggest internal disagreements and tough decisions. If the probability is too high that a student will be compelled to sacrifice his personal zip and those activities that made him interesting to the College in the first place, however, just to keep his head barely above water academically, it seems kinder in the long run to sting him in school momentarily with a rejection letter than to see him suffer under an impossible work load over an extended time period here in Cambridge.

In practice, students in the program must be in the top 10 to 15 percent of their graduating classes, must be enrolled in their schools' most difficult courses of study, and must score an average of 400 or better on SAT (although most score better than 500, with emphasis given to verbal aptitude). Heavy emphasis, given that the minimum requirements are met, is placed on personal qualities such as "toughness, sparkle, resilience, flexibility, and energy," because "our faculty and administration have persuaded us over the last nine years that possessing most of them is essential to a disadvantaged student's success and happiness in this single, particular college community."

The program contained 17 students in 1966–67. It is emphatically not

> "geared to help dropouts, delinquents, and underachievers and the reason we have refrained from such activity is simple. Harvard College simply does not have those special, remedial, or reduced course work loads necessary to conduct such an operation."

3. *University of California at Berkeley*. Berkeley's enterprise, called the "Educational Opportunity Program," consists of an intensive recruiting effort, largely in the Bay Area, to find minority-group students who would not normally be eligible for Berkeley. They are admitted under the 2 percent discretionary quota available to each campus of the University. In autumn 1967, 370 students were enrolled in the program, 60 percent of whom were not normally admissible under state entrance standards.

According to its director, "The heart of our program consists of increasing opportunities in these areas: assistance in getting admitted, financial support needed to attend college, and academic assistance needed to stay in college." The academic assistance consists of an organized tutorial program, some remedial courses, and a more flexible interpretation at the start of the student's career of the normal rules for academic probation and suspension.

We have found no basis on which to judge the quality of minority-group students admitted to Berkeley under the E.O.P. compared to those admitted to Stanford. The numbers are surely larger (though smaller as a percentage of total enrollment), but available data do not permit assessment of quality.

4. *Cornell*. Here the program is called "Opportunity." In 1967–68, there are 150 Opportunity students at Cornell; 135 are Negro. Students in the program are permitted to take a reduced course load and make up the difference in the summer or in an extra year. Some students attend summer courses before enrollment, usually taking one regular course and one remedial reading course if needed. The Assistant Admissions Director at Cornell reports his pride that Cornell has created an atmosphere in which minority-group cultures can be expressed and free speech is enjoyed, "even if the views of a radical or militant Negro student are sometimes to the discomfort of the faculty."

5. Many other institutions have programs of one or another description or name, Project Share, for example, and Project Seek. (The success of this program is attested to by its director on the evidence that "Negro students are eating with white students in the dining rooms" and a Seek student won the lead in a student production of "The Emperor Jones." This from a large state university in a big, rich, enlightened, northern state.) The sample presented here is, we believe, sufficient for our purposes.

Observations About the Nature of Stanford University

We move from fact to value. In transition we pause to observe some characteristics of Stanford that seem relevant to a consideration of future possibilities. Some are obvious, some less so. Some may be viewed as constraints on future policy, others as opportunities. All, we believe, must be taken into account in the making of policy.

1. A large fraction of the faculty effort at this institution is devoted to graduate instruction and research. The most obvious consequence of this fact is that the time which the faculty has available or is disposed to devote to undergraduates is less than is the case at institutions without large graduate programs or at universities with faculty whose special responsibility is the instruction of undergraduates. There are, thus, very real practical limits on the ability of the faculty to give extra attention to any group of undergraduates.

2. Faculty at Stanford are accustomed to teach, and they seem to want to teach, the best students available. "Best" in this context is evaluative only along a single scale—the ability to perform intellectual manipulations. To the extent that faculty pressures affect admissions practices, those pressures seem to move largely in the direction of higher quality, measured by test scores, grade point averages, and like measures of academic achievement and promise.

We are aware, of course, that "the faculty" is not a seamless whole. There are differences of opinion, of emphasis, of willingness to change present norms. We report here our impression of dominant views among the faculty. If our impression is wrong, that can be known by expressions of faculty opinion that have not yet been forthcoming.

The importance of this particular characteristic is obvious. Academic standards are set by those who teach. The kind of teaching which they are prepared to do determines what those standards will be and, hence, the kinds of students who can be expected to meet them. Stanford's faculty has shown no sign that it is prepared to change the kind of teaching it does in order to educate students who are markedly less prepared than those currently enrolled. As at Harvard, the view at Stanford appears to be that remedial teaching is not part of our business.

3. Third, the culture of the Stanford community is not very supportive of

those who have problems, be they social or academic. The norm is achievement, competitive achievement. Our caution about pass-fail grading and our continued reliance on the curve, especially in the first two years, are but two pieces of evidence. The non-urban, residential character of this University fosters its rather homogeneous social structure. The testimony of students about the values that they perceive as important at Stanford is perhaps the most telling evidence of all. Under present conditions, to recruit to this community students who can be expected to have extreme problems of academic and social adjustment would be cruel, fruitless, and self-defeating. We do not believe, however, that this particular aspect of the Stanford community is beyond change, and we note that many elements of the community advocate such change.

4. Finally, Stanford sits in the midst of the largest and most effective junior college system in the country. This system has not been thoroughly canvassed as a source of student talent at the sophomore and junior levels. Some students from these colleges, of course, transfer to Stanford, but on the whole it is the students who seek us out, not vice versa. The contrast to our freshman recruiting is very evident. It is only a slight overstatement to say that, should either Stanford or the California junior colleges disappear overnight, neither would be much changed by the loss of the other.

We have not undertaken here a complete description of this University and its milieu. We have ignored both strengths and weaknesses and identified only those characteristics that seem to us most directly relevant to the issue at hand. In turning now from what is, as we see it, to what ought to be, we deal first with general policy prescriptions and then with specific recommendations.

The Future of Minority Groups at Stanford

For most of its history, Stanford's record in the education of students who are outside the mainstream of white, middle-class America leaves much to be desired. In the last three years the record has improved to the point where it can now be characterized as merely bad. These are not comparative judgments, they are absolute. It is no part of our concern here that other institu-

tions have been or are as bad, or worse. We are here concerned about this University—what it is and what it ought to be.

Stanford's educational role—given the facts that it is a university, that its faculty is among the most distinguished, and that its commitment to research is deep and fundamental to its nature—is to seek out and educate the best young talent in the country. It fails to do so, because many minority-group youngsters have been, and to a lesser extent are now, effectively denied an opportunity to attend Stanford. We may be getting the best, but they are the best of only a partial universe.

Our argument is not that unqualified students should be admitted to Stanford because they happen, at this point in time, to be the best prepared of their social, economic, ethnic, or racial group; our point is that talent exists that Stanford is missing. We admit that we have no idea how large this pool of talent is. Potentially, of course, it is immense; the criminal waste of human beings who happen to be black, or of Mexican descent, or American Indian, or white but poor is so immense as to make one wonder that so profligate a nation could survive, much less prosper. We are convinced that the talent exists and that it can be found. The relatively modest effort of the past three years to find it will result in more Negro Stanford B.A.'s in the class of 1970 than the normal course of events would have produced in two decades or more.

We recognize that the educational plight of Negro Americans is a staggering national problem and that any direct contribution Stanford might make to its solution is necessarily more symbolic than significant, if significance is judged by numbers; nevertheless, we think that special efforts to enroll Negroes are essential from a moral point of view. Moreover, the education of our white students requires that they have greater opportunity for contact with black students.

We do not contemplate elaborate remedial programs. We do not deny or undervalue the importance of remedying the disastrous results of educational neglect in the lower schools. We simply assert that Stanford's impact on society will be greatest if its sights are on the highest quality. If we do our job properly, promising students with adequate preparation can be given excellent education and can carry with them throughout their lives the highest standards of quality.

We recognize that this is a point on which honest men may disagree. Some think that this University should accept much lower standards of preparation for minority-group students and remedy their deficiencies on campus. This is

an attractive point of view. Not the least of its attractions is its underlying appeal for the correction of long-suffered injustice. We do not disagree, but we believe that each institution must find its own unique strengths and put them to the service of social justice. We wish to search for those strengths and the ways to use them at Stanford. No policy for the future will work or deserves to be taken seriously unless it is derived from clear notions of what this University is all about.

Recommendations

The recommendations that follow derive from the principles that academic quality is our goal, that academic quality exists in groups that have not been well represented in the Stanford community, and that the responsibility of this University is to look for quality actively and to reward it adequately.

Recruiting

Recommendation 1. The effort already underway to recruit students in high schools of predominantly minority-group enrollment has begun to produce results. It should be made even more intensive, and it should be extended to more such schools outside the state of California.

Recommendation 2. In order to be successful in minority-group areas, a recruiter must be sensitive to the culture to which he appeals. Arguments that attract the Groton student to Stanford may be quite different from those which appeal to the student from Watts. For this reason and others, it is not only useful but probably crucial to involve in the recruiting process minority-group students already at Stanford. These people provide the bridge between the University and cultures that have long been alien to it. More honestly and vividly than anyone else, they can present to prospective students both the advantages and disadvantages of Stanford as a place to study, and they can sensitize our recruiters to the most effective approaches to minority-group students. It is possible that special printed materials should be developed for this effort or that existing materials should be revised with the minority-group student in mind.

Recommendation 3. More vigorous attention should be given to active recruiting of minority-group students in the junior colleges of California. One

of several reasons for their existence is to provide a place for students with mediocre high school records to show their capacity for college-level work. We should use them for that purpose.

Recommendation 4. We recommend further the exploration of a formal tie with an institution like the College of San Mateo, which has an active and apparently successful minority-group recruiting program. We envision joint recruiting and a commitment for Stanford to admit a specified number of students with the necessary financial aid if they do well in their junior college programs.

Admissions Standards

Recommendation 5. Test scores and grade point averages, which presently count heavily in Stanford's admissions procedures, place students from minority groups at a distinct disadvantage. This Committee will later recommend specific policies concerning admissions criteria and procedures. We now recognize that any standards of admission must contain built-in exceptions for students from minority groups. Moreover, special consideration should be given these students so that their personal qualifications for attending Stanford will be assessed in terms of the experiences of minority-group students who are already enrolled here.

Recommendation 6. We make no recommendation on the number or proportion of minority-group students Stanford should admit. There are too few now, and we can hardly foresee the time when there will be too many. The question of numbers will not become a real one so long as quality, given the best judgments available to humans, remains the standard. We believe that minority groups at Stanford should be large enough to provide mutual support for their members and to voice the special concerns of the minority groups.

Recommendation 7. We recommend that Stanford make special efforts to encourage the minority-group students who are admitted to enroll at Stanford. Nearly one-third of Negroes recently admitted declined their acceptances, and this group appears at least as talented as those who accepted.

Financial Aid

Recommendation 8. It is hardly bold to urge the University to put high priority on efforts to raise more money for undergraduate financial aid. No matter how prosaic, however, it is clear that one key obstacle to the accomplishment of the desired end is the inadequate financial aid budget. The only answer, over the long run, is more money. Our recommendation is: find it.

Recommendation 9. In the short run, we recommend that admissible minority-group students be accommodated first from available resources, without regard to their "quality group" ranking. No single immediate change in practice could do more to produce an immediate increase in the minority-group population at Stanford. For various reasons, larger proportions of such financial aid should consist of scholarships and smaller proportions of loans and earnings from part-time jobs.

Recommendation 10. Our recommendations imply the need to change existing policies so that financial aid will be offered to minority-group students who transfer to Stanford from junior colleges.

After Admission

Recommendation 11. The freshman year at Stanford is not easy for any student, much less so for students with deficiencies in preparation. Not only is the work difficult in substance; competition multiplies its intrinsic difficulties. We believe that grading policies should be modified to reduce competitive pressures, particularly during the freshman year. We would not lower academic standards; we would remove the kind of competition that has little to do with real academic achievement and that provides little useful information for subsequent evaluation of students.

Our present interest in this reform lies in the wholly beneficial effect it would have on the "academic socialization" of a group of students who will be judged to have ability, but who will find it difficult to develop that ability if they must be graded immediately not on their own merits but in relation to others who are better able to compete for grades. A goal of the University is to nurture talent; the freshman year, perhaps more than any other, is crucial to the attainment of the goal. It makes good sense to provide for all students the proper conditions for accommodation to academic life; it is essential for those whose talents have been laid waste by years of inadequate preparation.

Recommendation 12. We recommend the establishment of a tutorial program for those students who need it and who wish to use it. We have no fixed views on the organization or staffing of such a program. In general, we foresee a mixture of undergraduate, graduate, and faculty tutors. Some might be paid but most would volunteer their services. It is important from the point of view of the tutee that the service be voluntary—available, but in no sense required. Within such broad outlines, a number of specific arrangements seem feasible. Such a program could facilitate the development of significant relationships with many minority-group students.

Conclusion

We are aware that our recommendations do not exhaust the potentially useful measures. If others in so inventive a community did not have ideas that have not occurred to us, we would be surprised and disappointed. We present this interim report not with a sense of completion, but with hope for a new beginning.

April 2, 1968

5. Undergraduate Financial Aid

Report of
the topic committee

Recommendation 1. The level of undergraduate financial aid should continue to be determined on the basis of an individual's computed need.

Currently some 900 colleges and universities use the need approach, the key measure of which is the College Scholarship Service Parents' Confidential Statement, an elaborate form submitted in the name of each person applying for financial aid. From the information in the statement, the College Scholarship Service estimates the amount of money that the family can contribute to the cost of the student's education. Each school then determines the amount of financial aid that it should offer to its own applicants. Schools can vary the portions of grant, loan, and work-income in the aid packages they offer; thus they may compete for desirable candidates. Although the need formula is imperfect, it has the pragmatic advantage of treating equitably college applicants of differing economic backgrounds. The formula is, however, inevitably skewed in individual cases when a specific applicant pool is assigned a predetermined amount of financial aid to be proffered.

Substantial sums of money are allocated to entering male freshmen through the Athletics Department, under procedures that do not always consider financial need. We have not reviewed policy and procedures in this area, but suggest that they may need to be considered in light of an overall adjustment in financial aid policy.

Recommendation 2. Undergraduate financial aid should be given higher priority in the allocation of University resources, and the financial aid budget, once set, should be guaranteed as a minimum for periods of several years each.

With sufficient funds and an appropriate applicant pool, any university could ideally select for its undergraduate body the desired mix of abilities, interests, and socio-economic backgrounds. Because of financial aid restrictions, however, Stanford must admit many students who do not require financial aid. In addition, applicants who can bring money with them through National Merit, California State, NROTC scholarships, or other special funds are being given admissions preferences. Although these applicants are often clearly admissible and should perform well at Stanford, admitting them can reduce the number of places available for the preferred undergraduates. Educational merits of admitting the preferred applicants should not be impaired by restrictions on financial aid.

Current budgeting procedures at Stanford annually adjust the financial aid budget to fit the general financial situation of the University, particularly the income from gifts. This procedure militates against the development, operation, and assessment of stable recruitment and admissions policies and practices.

Recommendation 3. Informal or covert linking of admissions and financial aid procedures should be discontinued; any such linking should be formalized, clearly defined, and publicized.

Currently the claim is made that "a lack of financing will not prevent any student admitted to the University from completing his undergraduate studies." This statement gives a wrong impression that admissions and financial aid decisions are made independently. The resulting confusion can only produce a credibility gap between the University and its public (including alumni, friends, potential students, and their parents).

Recommendation 4. Priorities in the awarding and types of financial aid, and the relationship of financial aid to admissions should be as shown in the following table.

The priorities suggested here aim at fulfilling certain University objectives and at correcting inequities in the present system. Priority 1 has existed at Stanford for some time. Priority 2 is already a stated objective of the Univer-

Distribution of Freshman Financial Aid Resources

Priority	Type of Aid
1. Aid applicants from minority groups who meet the open competition for admission.	Grant which, coupled with established family contribution, will cover all costs.
2. Aid applicants from minority groups who do not meet the open competition, but who are admitted by special arrangement.	Grant which, coupled with established family contribution, will cover all costs.
3. Aid applicants of outstanding merit, not to exceed 5 to 10 percent of total admittees.	Grant which, coupled with established family contribution, will cover all costs.
4. Aid applicants from all competition categories[10], ranked in order, admitted without regard for or referral to financial need. The number of admittees in this group will be set so that the financial needs of the last admittee will exhaust the available aid.	All costs will be covered by a combination of: 1) established family contribution, 2) loan (possibly up to $400–500 per year), 3) grant and work, after maximum loan has been given.
5. (If necessary to fill admissions quota.) Aid applicants from all competition categories, ranked in order, admitted without regard for or referral to financial need.	No financial aid provided. (It can be expected that those applicants with large financial need will not enroll at Stanford.)

sity administration, lacking only the number of students to be recruited. It should be emphasized that funds to cover special academic needs of Priority 2 students must also be made available.

Priorities 3 and 4, however, represent a substantial departure from present University policy, according to which about 35 percent of the entering class have their financial need met by grants alone. The grant recipients are selected according to their position on the grid of predicted grade point average and personal rating. Although Stanford should continue to do everything possible to attract outstanding students, the differences in ability and desirability of students below the top 5 percent to 10 percent among our highly selected student body are not so great as to justify the differential distribution of grant money according to academic promise. Such differences as may exist are only accentuated if the less able students must work while the more

[10] See our earlier comments, Selection Procedures and Criteria.

able ones do not work. Even apart from this consideration, the moral argument is strong for giving all students in Priority 4 equal treatment.

Priority 5 points clearly to one of the dilemmas confronting Stanford today. Fulfilling the commitment to disadvantaged students (Priority 2) may call for more than half of Stanford's annual input to undergraduate financial aid. *Unless more funds are found*, it follows that applicants who, under the present procedure, would be offered partial aid would now be offered none, and the places of those who cannot come without aid would be filled by those who can come without aid. Such an operation would result in a student body that would be economically polarized. If this polarization occurs and cannot be reduced by an increased financial aid budget, consideration should be given to a modified admissions procedure in which applicants from the middle economic group (i.e., some financial need but not total) receive graded bonus points in appropriate competition categories. (See our earlier comments, Selection Procedures and Criteria.)

It is our conclusion that the assignment of financial aid awards to entering undergraduates can be accomplished as an integral part of the revised admissions procedures recommended earlier.

Recommendation 5. Financial aid policy relating to the continuation and form of aid allocations should be explicitly stated and the decision criteria well publicized.

The continuation of financial aid must depend, first of all, on the individual's need, which may change from year to year. Whatever the need, however, the form in which it is met should change as the *educational* needs of the student change; the form of aid should not, therefore, be expected to remain the same for four years. Academically strong freshmen or sophomores on grants should expect a shift toward jobs with loans as an alternative; academically faltering students should not be expected to work. Of course, care must be taken to avoid the appearance of rewarding poor academic achievement (see *Recommendation 9*). Grants should be concentrated in the freshman year and thereafter should normally shift to increasing proportions of loans and jobs during the remaining undergraduate years.

Changes in the level or form of financial aid to individual students will not be recognized as equitable unless financial aids policy is explicitly stated and the criteria for decision openly known. The dignity and educational wisdom that should characterize the allocation of financial aid will never develop in an atmosphere of student distrust or anger over decisions that appear to be

arbitrary. Barring changes in need, no student should find his financial aid cut off unless his academic performance precludes a reasonable chance of graduation.

Recommendation 6. The University should find the means for establishing a long-term, low-interest, loan fund available to *all* students.

This recommendation aims primarily to help those students who do not choose family support but do not qualify for regular financial aid because available family funds are by formula deemed adequate. Such a loan fund could also diminish the gap that often exists between computed need (on the basis of which aid is allocated) and "felt" need (on the basis of which aid is requested).

Recommendation 7. Matriculated undergraduates who develop financial need should be given consideration equal to the consideration given to those currently receiving financial aid.

Recommendation 8. Financial aid policies and procedures applied to freshmen should not in principle be varied with respect to transfer students.

Recommendation 9. The element of work in the aid package should be reviewed; jobs having little to do with the educational process should be minimized, and jobs involving educational merit or status should be maximized.

Once the appropriate channel is established and publicized, it should be possible to *find* jobs (n.b., not *create* jobs) in academic departments, special projects–such as SES, tutoring Priority 2 students, recruiting undergraduate applicants–sufficient to fill the need for jobs in the aid packages. If a student prefers waiting tables or hashing, he should be allowed to do so, but alternatives should be as broad and as interesting as a university can make them.

Appendix to the Reports of the Topic Committee 1. Summary of Data

1. Applicant Pool Study

A stratified random sample of 824 applicants was drawn from the applicant pool for the year 1966–67. The sample was stratified as follows: 415 applicants rejected, 210 applicants accepted and enrolled, 199 applicants accepted and not enrolled. Approximately 50 items of information were coded for each member of the sample, the principal sources being the application for admission and the counselor's recommendation form. These data items were the following:

Academic. High school GPA, SAT-verbal, SAT-math, predicted GPA, rank in class.

Evaluation. Personal rating, Admissions decision.

Background Characteristics. Sex, race, area of residence, size of hometown, type of high school, father's occupation, father's employer, father's education, mother's occupation, mother's employer, mother's education, probable career, probable major.

High School Activities. Academic honors, school office, athletics, dramatics, forensics, music, art, literary, journalism, service organizations, summer or part-time work.

Counselor's Ratings. Academic ability, motivation, writing, speech, energy and initiative, independence, originality, leadership, self-confidence, warmth, sense of humor, concern for others, reaction to criticism, reaction to setbacks, respect accorded by students, respect accorded by faculty, academic recommendation, character recommendation, overall recommendation.

In analyzing these data, we used the computer to answer the following questions:

1. What characteristics are associated with being admitted to Stanford?
2. What characteristics are associated with admitted applicants' deciding to enroll?
3. In what ways do accepted applicants differ from the applicant pool as a whole?
4. If admissions decisions were made on a random basis, how would the accepted students differ from those who actually were accepted?
5. If the only admissions criterion were predicted GPA, how would the accepted students differ from those who actually were accepted?
6. How do the individual items in the counselor's recommendation form relate to each other?

It was decided that the tables produced in answer to these questions were not susceptible to summary presentation and were too voluminous to present in their entirety. Those who wish to examine the data are urged to visit or write the SES office (142 Meyer Library) for a copy of the tables.

2. Faculty Identification of Exceptional Students.

In cooperation with the Admissions Office, a study was undertaken to identify students that faculty members have found especially rewarding to teach. All of the faculty involved in teaching undergraduates were asked to name their three "best" students, from the class of '68.

Two principal methods were used in analyzing the responses to this request; first, named students were compared with the senior class as a whole on characteristics such as overall GPA, male-female ratio, and transfer-non-transfer ratio; second, the admissions data on named students was compared with that on unnamed students for characteristics differentiating the two groups.

Copies of a report on this study are available at the SES office.

3. Other Data, Previous Studies, Background Sources.

Prior to the writing of the report Forming the Applicant Pool, inquiries were made of the admissions officers at 11 colleges and universities, requesting information on the relationships between the follow-

ing processes with respect to personnel, sources of information, investments of time and resources, and goals: recruiting applicants, assessing and admitting applicants, enticing admitted applicants to enroll, and helping newly enrolled students adjust to their new environments. The responses were compared both with each other and with the Stanford practice; no formal summary has been prepared beyond that which appears in the report.

In the summer of '67, the Counseling and Testing Center sent a questionnaire to about 1,000 accepted applicants, about half of whom decided to enroll. Among other things, the students were asked to select from a long list of items the ten factors that most influenced their final college choice. Two tables summarize the answers to this question, and copies are available at the SES office.

Several previous studies were heavily relied upon, especially in the early stages of Committee deliberations. Among these studies were the following:

Some Personal and Background Facts About Entering Stanford Freshmen, John D. Black, Counseling & Testing Center, February 1967.

Report to the Humanities and Sciences Faculty of the Ad Hoc Committee on Admissions Policies and Practices, 1967.

The Relative Weighting of High School Grade Point Average and Scholastic Aptitude Tests in Stanford Admissions, Victor R. Lovell, Counseling & Testing Center, 1967.

Attitude and Interest Inventory–1966, a report by the student members of the student-faculty subcommittee on admissions.

Summary Data on Entering Freshmen, Stanford University and weighted national norms, American Council on Education, December 1967.

Preparing School Counselors in Educational Guidance, College Entrance Examination Board, 1967.

College Admissions and the Public Interest, B. Alden Thresher, College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Distribution copies of these reports and publications are not available, but copies may be examined at the SES office.

Appendix to the Reports of the Topic Committee 2. Student Recruiters

Introduction

We here suggest guidelines which a Recruiting Council may find helpful in organizing and supervising a student recruiter program, including selection, training, and the mechanics of recruiting trips. Student recruiters should not be junior admissions officers but rather publicity agents who would familiarize high school students with Stanford, answer questions, and encourage applications. Student recruiters may occasionally identify a particularly outstanding applicant, but they should not be preselectors.

Who would recruit?

Student recruiters should be selected by the Recruiting Council. Efforts should be made to include those students already working with local alumni clubs as Student Associates. Personal interviews should evaluate the potential recruiter's interests and abilities. The student recruiters should represent a diversity of interests and talents. As experience is gained, students who have done recruiting could encourage other students to participate. Ideally, students would be selected and trained in the spring of their freshman or sophomore year in order that they might recruit for at least two years.

The Recruiting Council should also utilize those student organizations whose members already travel for Stanford during the academic year. Speech meets, athletic events, alumni conferences, student press conventions, model UN meetings, and job hunting (for Stanford-in-Washington, Stanford-in-Sacramento, Stanford Management Intern Program, etc.) are only a few of the activities to which Stanford sends representatives. The coordination of recruiting missions with such trips would avoid duplicate expenses. (Special attention should be paid to younger faculty as potential recruiters; their professional travel in combination with recruiting trips should be encouraged and possibly subsidized by the University.)

Training

The Recruiting Council would initially design the training program. After the first year, former student recruiters could assume much of the responsibility for planning and orientation (as is done, for example, in the Overseas Campuses Student Board). By wise use of available resources, the training program could focus on helping students to communicate more effectively to groups and on providing practice in difficult interaction situations they might encounter. Students would serve as recruiters precisely because they are students and have immediate, first-hand knowledge of Stanford. Training sessions should therefore concentrate on presentation techniques and travel arrangements rather than on facts about the University.

Recruiting Trips

Our admissions officers who are acquainted with the personnel of hundreds of high schools across the country can do much to help student recruiters. Through their representation on the Recruiting Council, they can share their knowledge and expertise and assist in the selection of schools to be visited.

Whenever possible, student recruiters should work in pairs. After the first year of the program, continuity could be fostered by pairing a new recruiter with an experienced recruiter and by sending the pair to an area previously visited by the experienced member. Geographic identity would be maximized by assigning recruiters to their home areas where they have some familiarity with the high schools and can more easily arrange housing and transportation. Where this cannot be done, local alumni clubs could provide assistance. Recruiting should be done whenever it can be arranged, taking

into account the desires of high schools, the Stanford academic calender, the high school visiting program of the Admissions Office, and the travel plans of student organizations. To exert an impact on the current applicant pool, recruiting trips should be concentrated in the period from October to January; trips made later in the year would be directed toward high school juniors.

The Recruiting Encounter

The recruiting "pitch" must be an individual matter, and the recruiter's approach must be appropriate to his talents and to the type of school he is visiting. In some cases, large meetings with high school juniors and seniors might be called for, while in other instances recruiters may wish to talk to students individually or in small groups. Recruiters might accompany their talks with slides or distribute copies of campus publications.

The recruiting effort must not end with the visit to a particular high school. Recruiters should maintain communications directly (or indirectly through the Recruiting Council and University Relations) with interested high school students and key personnel (teachers and counselors), offering assistance, answering questions, and encouraging applications. After letters of acceptance have been mailed, recruiters should write personal letters (or sign letters written by the Recruiting Council) to those accepted students they met on recruiting trips.

Time Investment

The proposed recruiting program is intended to involve a large number of student recruiters for short periods of time. The program should not require any student to devote an inordinate amount of time to recruiting during the academic year. Actual recruiting efforts would be concentrated in a one- or two-day period, possibly when Stanford is not in session.

Evaluation

Since this program is an experiment, continuous feedback and evaluation are vital. Student recruiters might periodically meet with the Recruiting Council to report experiences and offer suggestions for improvement.

The critera for determining the success or failure of this program are roughly those points mentioned in the main body of this report: the recruitment of an applicant pool, which 1) includes students possessing a wide variety of social background characteristics; 2) includes a broad range for each characteristic; and 3) is capable of change from year to year.

In its evaluations it is important that the Recruiting Council separate the effectiveness of the recruiting personnel from that of the program organization.

Appendix to the Report of the Steering Committee

In response to a request from the Steering Committee for a full statement on disagreements with our recommendations, Dean Snyder submitted the following memorandum:

To: The Steering Committee on the Study of Education at Stanford

From: Rixford K. Snyder
Dean of Admissions

The Steering Committee of the Study of Education at Stanford "is anxious to see to it that the discussion that takes place once the report is issued is as well informed as possible." The report of the Sub-Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid contains information that is in some instances incomplete, in others incorrect, and in still others based on opinions not supported by the facts. Any informed and scholarly discussion should take these qualities of the report into account. These deficiencies have been reported both orally and in writing to the authors.

Further, as the report suggests, some of the recommendations cannot be implemented until substantial sums of money are added to the Admissions budget, and until greatly increased time on the computers is placed at the disposal of the Admissions staff—two prerequisites which cannot be assured to the Dean of Admissions at the present time, or indeed, for several years.

In addition, recommendations designed to increase the social and economic diversity of the entering Freshman Class will, in the judgment of the Admissions staff which has actually worked with thousands of folders over a period of years, accomplish precisely the opposite—select more students who are grade-conscious, more from the wealthy suburban high schools, and fewer with talents and backgrounds which contribute to an exciting class and a more socially mobile and diverse student body.

Also, the extensive emphasis on competitions by computer runs, adjustable and weighted bonus points, shifts in the sex ratio, and random selection of a stated percentage of the class will seriously alter the distribution of undergraduates by majors within departments and, at the same time, do irreparable damage to University relations with parents of candidates, with the better candidates themselves who do not want to be reduced to a key punch, with secondary school officials and teachers, with many members of the Stanford faculty, and with alumni.

Finally, the recommendations in regard to transfer students, although good in theory, cannot be implemented without a serious impact on the total number of undergraduates enrolled.

The Dean of Admissions submitted to the Steering Committee 22 pages of detailed comment on the above-mentioned points for use by the Sub-Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid. These pages are on file for the information of interested persons in the Office of the Study of Education at Stanford.

November 25, 1968

Respectfully submitted.